Overview of the CASE Act and Related Materials
THE CASE ACT: How It Will Work

How the CASE Act Small Claims Court Will Work in Practice

The Copyright Alternative in Small-Claims Enforcement Act of 2019” (the “CASE Act”), H.R. 2426 and S. 1273, would create a low-cost, voluntary, streamlined tribunal within the U.S. Copyright Office to handle small copyright claims brought by copyright owners and users of copyrighted works. The relatively simple 10 step process for bringing and resolving a case before the CASE Act’s Copyright Claims Board is set forth below.

**STEP 1:**
A claim is discovered and discussions between the parties fail to resolve the issue.

**STEP 2:**
The Claimant files a claim (or claims) with the Copyright Claims Board (CCB).

**STEP 4:**
If the claim meets the CASE Act requirements, the Claimant notifies the Respondent about his or her claim by serving the Respondent (consistent with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure) and explaining the proceedings and the claim (as required by the CASE Act). The CCB sends a follow-up notification to make sure the Respondent understands the proceedings and the consequences of not responding.

**STEP 3:**
The CCB attorneys examine the claim to make sure it meets the CASE Act’s requirements. If it does not, the Claimant has an opportunity to amend the claim.

**STEP 5:**
The Respondent has 60 days to decide whether to opt out or participate in the proceeding.1 If the Respondent opts out, the case is immediately terminated.

---

1 This 60-day period may be extended for another 60 days under exceptional circumstances. If the Respondent does not timely respond there is a lengthy process before a default judgment can be entered. For a detailed discussion of when and whether a default judgment can be entered see the separate default judgment paper.

**STEP 6:**
If the Respondent has not opted out, the CCB issues a scheduling order, supervises limited discovery relating to any claims and counterclaims, conducts conferences, and facilitates settlement conferences. The process is simplified and done remotely so that neither party needs to hire an attorney and travel is not necessary.

**STEP 7:**
Any time before a decision is rendered the CCB can dismiss the case for various reasons, such as a lack of evidence. The CCB can also dismiss claims brought for harassing or other improper purposes (and can order the party acting in bad faith to pay the other party’s costs), or the claims exceed the competence of the CCB.

**STEP 8:**
If the case is not dismissed and the parties have not settled, the CCB considers the facts and legal issues at stake in the case and renders a decision based on relevant federal court precedent.

**STEP 10:**
The parties have 30 days to request reconsideration by the CCB and another 30 days to request review by the Register of Copyrights.

---

The CASE Act is supported by creators and creators’ advocacy groups, including:
RESOLVED, That the American Bar Association supports legislation creating the establishment of a program within the U.S. Copyright Office with authority to adjudicate copyright small claims as a lower-cost, less-time-consuming alternative to federal court litigation of copyright claims, provided that participation in the program is voluntary for all parties to the dispute, the claim is limited to seeking the types of monetary relief permitted by the Copyright Act (including statutory damages, actual damages, and disgorgement of profits) and excludes injunctive relief, and the monetary relief is no more than a maximum set in accordance with the legislation (“Copyright Small Claims Program”); and

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the American Bar Association supports, in principle, that such legislation and any Copyright Small Claims Program reflect appropriate procedures and requirements, including:

(a) Requiring that adjudicators in the Copyright Small Claims Program have experience with copyright law and training in resolution of disputes;
(b) Allowing claims and responses to be submitted electronically, and to the extent a proceeding may require a hearing, using videoconference and teleconference technology, rather than requiring personal appearances; and allowing but not requiring parties to be represented by an attorney;
(c) Allowing parties to bring counterclaims in a Copyright Small Claims Program proceeding;
(d) Authorizing the Copyright Office to adopt appropriate rules and procedures to prevent abuse of the Copyright Small Claims Program;
(e) Allowing adjudicators in the Copyright Small Claims Program to consult with the Register of Copyrights on general issues of law; and
(f) Permitting the Register of Copyrights to review decisions of adjudicators in the Copyright Small Claims Program in appropriate circumstances.
REPORT

I. Introduction

Copyright owners with small infringement claims essentially have a right without a remedy. The cost of bringing a federal lawsuit significantly outstrips the value of their claims, and they cannot resort to state courts, since they can pursue copyright claims only in federal court. So they must endure infringements of their work. Congress, mindful of this problem, in 2011 requested the Copyright Office to undertake a study concerning new remedies to address copyright small claims, observing that “the inability to enforce one’s rights undermines the economic incentive to continue investing in the creation of new works . . . and deprives society of the benefit of new and expressive works of authorship.” The Copyright Office Small Claims Report, issued in 2013, “documents the challenges of resolving copyright small claims in the current legal system,” observed that the problem of enforcing modest-sized copyright claims “appears to be especially acute for individual creators,” and recommended the creation of a small claims tribunal within the Copyright Office.

Recently, bipartisan bills were introduced in both Houses of Congress to establish a Copyright Small Claims Program in the Copyright Office, with a cap on recovery of

---

1 See, e.g., Songwriters Guild of America testimony before the House Small Business Committee (May 14, 2018): [I]n order to enforce our rights against infringers, songwriters literally need to “make a Federal case out of it,” at an average cost of about $350,000 to bring a lawsuit in federal court. Since only a precious few songs ever earn that much money in their entire existence, songwriters are left with no practical way to combat the theft of our works. We have a right with no remedy in the most classic sense. We simply cannot afford access to enforcement in a world of rampant infringement.

According to Representative Ted Lieu:

More than 2 million hardworking artists in the United States rely on the U.S. Copyright Office to protect their livelihoods. For too long, our legal system skewed in favor of low-volume, high-value industries. But for many independent artists, whose claims of infringement often total a few thousand dollars, it is far too expensive to sue in federal court – essentially forcing creators to forfeit their rights. The Small Claims Board is an important step toward ensuring that digital photographers, graphic artists, illustrators, and others have a way to resolve disputes quickly and affordably.


2 Letter from Lamar Smith, Chairman, U.S. House Judiciary Committee to Maria Pallante, Register of Copyrights (Oct. 11, 2011). Specifically, he requested that the Copyright Office:

[U]ndertake a study to assess: 1) the extent to which authors and other copyright owners are effectively prevented from seeking relief from infringements due to constraints in the current system; and 2) furnish specific recommendations, as appropriate, for changes in administrative, regulatory and statutory authority that will improve the adjudication of small copyright claims and thereby enable all copyright owners to more fully realize the promise of exclusive rights enshrined in our Constitution. Id.

The ABA now has an opportunity to advocate in favor of a small claims program in the Copyright Office, which would provide small creators and copyright owners with effective access to justice, as well as benefits of the system intended for “the overall public good.”

This resolution supports the creation of a copyright small claims program for low-value copyright disputes. Specifically, it supports the establishment of such a program within the Copyright Office, where claims could be asserted and responded to by electronic means, and proceedings would be conducted via telephone or video-conference to minimize the costs of resolving a dispute. Participation would be voluntary for all parties; claims would be decided by experienced and knowledgeable attorneys; and there would be a cap on the dollar value of recovery for all claims asserted by a party in the proceeding.

Copyright law in the United States is exclusively federal law, with exclusive federal jurisdiction. Any claims for infringement must therefore be brought in federal court. But it is unrealistic, and sometimes impossible, for some copyright owners to bring suit in federal court. Many copyright owners (e.g., photographers) license their works for modest amounts of money, but manage to make a living by licensing many users. So, in addition to the risk of litigation and high cost of litigating a claim in federal court, their recovery in a successful infringement suit is likely to be only a fraction of the costs of bringing the suit. They usually endure infringement in these circumstances; for them, copyright is a right without a remedy. This problem is exacerbated by the internet, which has made it easy and efficient to copy protected works without authorization; many do so recognizing that there is no likelihood that the copyright owner will assert a claim.

The ABA has an important role to play in this area. The Association’s members have a broad perspective on the role and benefits of copyrights, as well as familiarity with copyright litigation and concerns with counseling clients who sometimes have no realistic recourse when their works are infringed. The ABA is familiar with a wide range of individual and public interests. The legislation supported by the Resolution would enable claimants to achieve a recovery for a meritorious infringement claim when they could not realistically bring an action in federal court, and would benefit defendants who may choose to participate in the Copyright Small Claims Program to minimize the cost and time of resolving the dispute and ensure that they are protected from liability for any amount over the cap on recovery in a Copyright Small Claims Program proceeding.


5 Copyright Office Small Claims Report, at 1.
The Importance of a Copyright Small Claims Program

Federal court litigation can be expensive. Such expenses frequently prevent copyright owners from protecting their intellectual property from infringement. The high cost of legal counsel, the time-consuming nature of discovery, and the high likelihood of loss when proceeding *pro se* have all made copyright infringement claims essentially unavailable for litigants that lack resources necessary to bring federal litigation.\(^6\)

Copyright owners who cannot afford to bring claims essentially must acquiesce to continued infringement. For all intents and purposes, they lose the protections of copyright. This, in turn, hinders copyright law from fulfilling its central function of incentivizing the creation of new expressive works. A Copyright Small Claims Program would solve this problem by allowing relatively small claims to be litigated in a forum designed to keep costs down and avoid lengthy litigation, giving individuals and other small-scale creators an effective means by which to take advantage of the rights afforded them by copyright law.

A Copyright Small Claims Program also would benefit defendants in small copyright suits. By allowing for expedited adjudication of small claims, a Copyright Small Claims Program would keep legal fees significantly lower than in a federal court adjudication. This would allow defendants to litigate against claims of infringement without risk of accumulating exorbitant fees—fees that can often exceed the cost of the claim at issue. It would also limit defendants’ exposure to the amount of the cap on remedies in a Copyright Small Claims Program proceeding.

Small claims programs have worked well in other areas of the law. For example, the ICANN Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution (“UDRP”) allows parties to resolve disputes over cybersquatting or confusingly similar domain names using a streamlined dispute resolution process. Claims are brought online and parties need not make personal appearances. Parties are still able to file suit in federal court, should they desire to do so, but the UDRP provides a low-cost and quick procedure that enables many small-scale domain name owners to successfully protect their trademark rights. While the UDRP is not entirely analogous to a Copyright Small Claims Program in that the UDRP’s authority to adjudicate claims arises from consent to UDRP policies of domain name registrars, its success nonetheless points to the benefits of creating low-cost, streamlined, and easy-to-use forums for adjudicating small claims.

Constitutional Issues

Article III of the U.S. Constitution potentially poses constraints on Congress’s ability to create tribunals to adjudicate civil claims when decision-makers in those tribunals are not granted lifetime appointments. Additionally, the Supreme Court has interpreted the Seventh Amendment as requiring that litigants have the option of having copyright claims heard before a jury. *See Feltner v. Columbia Pictures Television, Inc.*, 523 U.S. 340, 355 (1998). *See Copyright Office Small Claims Report at 27-28.

---

\(^6\) See Copyright Office Small Claims Report, at 11-13 (particular challenges of *pro se* litigants).
These constitutional constraints, however, can be addressed by requiring all parties to consent to adjudicating a claim using the Copyright Small Claims Program. Litigants are generally permitted to voluntarily waive their Article III right to have federal claims adjudicated in federal court by an Article III judge and their Seventh Amendment right to a civil jury. *Commodity Futures Trading Comm’n v. Schor*, 478 U.S. 833, 848-49 (1986) (“[A]s a personal right, Article III’s guarantee of an impartial and independent federal adjudication is subject to waiver, just as are other personal constitutional rights that dictate the procedures by which civil and criminal matters must be tried.”) It is for this reason that parties may consent to have claims heard by magistrate judges. Requiring the affirmative consent of all parties would make it far more likely that the Copyright Small Claims Program would not be subject to constitutional challenges. See Copyright Office Small Claims Program Report, at 97-99.

**IV. Details of a Copyright Small Claims Program**

Any potential Copyright Small Claims Program must be carefully crafted to ensure consistency with existing copyright law. The Resolution lists some important features of any potential Copyright Small Claims Program.

**Voluntary Participation.** A Copyright Small Claims Program should require the affirmative consent of all parties. By requiring parties to opt-in, there would be no doubt that all parties find Copyright Small Claims Program adjudication acceptable, thus avoiding potential challenges to Copyright Small Claims Program decisions down the line. Furthermore, an opt-in requirement would potentially remedy the constitutional issues that a Copyright Small Claims Program might generate, as discussed above.

**Remedies.** The recently-introduced bills call for an award cap of $30,000 per Copyright Small Claims Program proceeding, which in many cases will allow a sufficient recovery to prevailing copyright holders, while lowering the potential risk to defendants. The cap would be applicable to all claims brought in a single proceeding. In its report, the Copyright Office has proposed the same cap, citing empirical evidence that a large percentage of lawyers would refuse to represent a client with a claim for $30,000 or less. See Copyright Office Small Claims Report at 110. Certainly $30,000 appears to be a reasonable and workable cap, although other limits might also be effective.

There is no reason, however, to restrict the type of monetary remedies that can be awarded in a Copyright Small Claims Program. If the program is to serve as an attractive substitute to adjudication in the federal courts, claimants should be able to recover the same types of monetary remedies they would be able to recover in federal court, including actual damages, statutory damages, and disgorgement of profits, as appropriate.

It would be ill advised to permit injunctive relief in a Copyright Small Claims Program. Injunctive relief, such as an order to destroy merchandise, might have an economic impact that far exceeds the jurisdictional cap, and the Copyright Small Claims Program adjudicators may not realistically be in a position to take evidence and properly evaluate such economic ramifications. Permitting injunctive relief might lead some parties to seek to use the Copyright Small Claims Program simply because of its streamlined
procedures. Accordingly, injunctive relief for a copyright infringement claim should be available only in federal court, which is better positioned to ensure that parties have met the high evidentiary burdens necessary to justify the remedy.

**Adjudicators.** To ensure the proper functioning of a Copyright Small Claims Program, it is important that adjudicators be experienced lawyers who are well-versed in copyright law and alternative dispute resolution techniques. Experienced adjudicators will make it more likely that the small claims process is efficient, effective, and fair, and will avoid rendering decisions that might disturb the stability and coherence of the copyright law principles that have been developed by Congress and the federal courts.

**Electronic filing.** One of the reasons that the UDRP has been successful is that its proceedings occur electronically. Accordingly, the Copyright Small Claims Program should adopt this model and allow all filings to be made electronically. If possible, oral arguments should take place via teleconference or videoconference. Adopting an exclusively electronic format will allow parties to keep costs down by avoiding expensive travel and paper printing, and will allow cases to proceed more efficiently, since scheduling in-person appearances would become unnecessary.

**Attorney representation.** The Copyright Small Claims Program should permit parties to proceed with counsel, if they so desire. While a primary goal of the Copyright Small Claims Program would be to avoid the excessive costs of federal court litigation, there are still likely situations where representation by counsel is desirable, or even necessary. For example, considering that a corporation cannot appear in federal court without counsel, it is likely that corporations will desire to be represented by counsel even in Copyright Small Claims Program adjudications. And attorney representation would likely prove helpful to the parties and the adjudicators when it comes to particularly complicated claims, thus allowing these claims to be resolved quickly and fairly.

**Counterclaims.** In the interests of fairness and efficiency, parties to a Copyright Small Claims Program proceeding should be permitted to assert counterclaims, such as those that arise from the same transaction or occurrence that is the subject of the asserted claim of infringement of section 106 or a claim of violation of section 512(f) of the Copyright Act.

**Rules to prevent abuse.** It is possible that some claimants might use the Copyright Small Claims Program on a frequent basis to pressure defendants into unreasonable settlements, just as they do in federal court. The Register of Copyrights should be empowered to issue appropriate rules and regulations to prevent abuse of the Copyright Small Claims Program.

**Review by the Register of Copyrights.** Finally, it is important that the adjudicators be authorized to consult with the Register of Copyrights on legal issues, as necessary. The Register should be able to review substantive decisions by Copyright Small Claims Program adjudicators in appropriate circumstances.
The statute under which the Copyright Royalty Board operates offers useful precedent for allowing the adjudicators to consult with the Register of Copyrights on legal issues in connection with a Copyright Small Claims Program proceeding. Under 17 U.S.C. § 802(f)(1)(B), the Copyright Royalty Judges are required to “request a decision of the Register of Copyrights, in writing, to resolve” any “novel material question of substantive law concerning an interpretation of those provisions of [the Copyright Act] that are the subject of the proceeding.” Likewise, under 17 U.S.C. § 802(f)(1)(D), the “Register of Copyrights may review for legal error the resolution by the Copyright Royalty Judges of a material question of substantive law under [the Copyright Act] that underlies or is contained in a final determination of the Copyright Royalty Judges.”

V. Conclusion

As this report demonstrates, many copyright owners have no effective access to justice since the cost of lawsuits in federal courts is prohibitive, particularly when damages from an infringement are relatively small. There is a pressing need for a voluntary Copyright Small Claims Program within the Copyright Office to provide an inexpensive and efficient means of resolving copyright disputes that do not exceed a particular dollar amount. The ABA supports legislation to achieve this goal and supports appropriate procedures and requirements in connection with such a Program, such as those listed in the Resolution.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark K. Dickson  
Chair, Intellectual Property Law Section  
August 2019

Palmer Gene Vance II  
Chair, Litigation Section  
August 2019
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Submitting Entities: ABA Section of Intellectual Property Law and Section of Litigation
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1. Summary of Resolution

This Resolution addresses the reality that copyright owners with small infringement claims essentially have a right without a remedy and the related impact on public benefits of the copyright system. The costs of bringing a federal lawsuit significantly outstrips the value of their claims, and they cannot resort to state courts, since they can pursue copyright claims only in federal court. The Resolution supports legislation creating the establishment of a program within the U.S. Copyright Office with authority to adjudicate copyright small claims as a lower-cost, less-time-consuming alternative to federal court litigation of copyright claims, provided that participation in the program is voluntary for all parties to the dispute, the claim is limited to seeking the types of monetary relief permitted by the Copyright Act (including statutory damages, actual damages, and disgorgement of profits) and excludes injunctive relief, and the monetary relief is no more than a maximum set in accordance with the legislation (“Copyright Small Claims Program”), and supports such legislation including appropriate procedures and requirements, including those listed in the Resolution.

2. Approval by Submitting Entity:

Sponsorship of this Resolution was approved by the Section of Litigation in May 2019 and the Section of Intellectual Property Law in March 2019. This Resolution combines resolutions previously approved by the Council of the Section of Intellectual Property Law in February 2018, August 2017, December 2015, and February 2011.

3. Has this or a similar Resolution been submitted to the House of Delegates or Board of Governors previously?

No.

4. What existing Association policies are relevant to this Resolution and how would they be affected by its adoption?

None

5. If this is a late report, what urgency exists which requires action at this meeting of the House?

N/A
6. **Status of Legislation.**

HR 2426, Copyright Alternative in Small-Claims Enforcement Act of 2019 ("CASE Act of 2019"), and its Senate companion bill, S. 1273 were introduced on May 1, 2019. HR 2426 is cosponsored by Rep. Hakeem Jeffries (D-NY), Rep. Jerry Nadler (D-NY) (Chair, House Judiciary Committee), Rep. Hank Johnson (D-GA) (Chair, Courts, IP and the Internet Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee), Rep. Judy Chu (D-CA), Rep. Ted Lieu (D-CA), Rep. Doug Collins (R-GA) (Ranking Member, House Judiciary Committee), Rep. Martha Roby (R-AL) (Ranking Member, Courts, IP and the Internet Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee), Rep. Benjamin Cline (R-VA), and Rep. Brian Fitzpatrick (R-PA); and S. 1273, cosponsored by Sen. John Kennedy (R-LA), Sen. Tom Tillis (R-NC) (Chair, IP Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee), Sen. Richard Durbin (D-IL), and Sen. Mazie Hirono (D-HI). A hearing was held on the House version of this bill during the previous Congressional session, and the sponsors have indicated that are hopeful that there will be a mark-up of the bill over the summer.

7. **Brief explanation regarding plans for implementation of the policy, if adopted by the House of Delegates.**

The policy would provide the basis for the Association advocating for the CASE Act of 2019 (HR 2426 and S 1273) or for other legislation establishing a Copyright Small Claims Program consistent with the Resolution.

8. **Cost to the Association. (Both direct and indirect costs)**

None.

9. **Disclosure of Interest. (If applicable)**

None

10. **Referrals.**

The Resolution and Report have been distributed to each of the other Sections, Divisions, Forums, and Standing Committees of the Association in the version accepted and numbered for the agenda by the Rules and Calendar Committee.
11. **Contact Name and Address Information.** (Prior to the meeting. Please include name, address, telephone number and e-mail address):

Mark K. Dickson  
Section Chair, Section of Intellectual Property Law  
Phase M Legal  
205 De Anza Blvd., Ste. 212  
San Mateo, CA 94402-3989  
Tel: (650) 346-6675  
mdickson@phasem.com

Palmer Gene Vance, II  
Section Chair, Section of Litigation  
Stoll Keenon Ogden PLLC  
300 West Vine Street  
Lexington, KY 40507-1801  
gene.vance@skofirm.com

Susan Barbieri Montgomery  
Section Delegate, Section of Intellectual Property Law  
416 Huntington Avenue  
Boston, MA 02115  
Tel.: (617) 373-7071  
S.Montgomery@northeastern.edu

Judith A. Miller  
Section Delegate, Section of Litigation  
5215 Chamberlin Avenue  
Chevy Chase, MD 20815  
judith.miller3@gmail.com

12. **Contact Name and Address Information.** (Who will present the Report to the House?)

Susan Barbieri Montgomery  
Section Delegate, Section of Intellectual Property Law  
416 Huntington Avenue  
Boston, MA 02115  
Tel.: (617) 373-7071  
S.Montgomery@northeastern.edu
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. **Summary of the Resolution**

   This Resolution addresses the reality that copyright owners with small infringement claims essentially have a right without a remedy and the related impact on public benefits of the copyright system. The costs of bringing a federal lawsuit significantly outstrip the value of their claims, and they cannot resort to state courts, since they can pursue copyright claims only in federal court. The Resolution supports legislation creating the establishment of a program within the U.S. Copyright Office with authority to adjudicate copyright small claims as a lower-cost, less-time-consuming alternative to federal court litigation of copyright claims, provided that participation in the program is voluntary for all parties to the dispute, the claim is limited to seeking the types of monetary relief permitted by the Copyright Act (including statutory damages, actual damages, and disgorgement of profits) and excludes injunctive relief, and the monetary relief is no more than a maximum set in accordance with the legislation (“Copyright Small Claims Program”), and supports such legislation including appropriate procedures and requirements, including those listed in the Resolution.

2. **Summary of the Issue that the Resolution Addresses**

   Mindful of the problems of access and the reality of a right without a remedy for copyright owners with small claims, Congress requested the Copyright Office undertake a study concerning new remedies to address small copyright claims, observing that “the inability to enforce one’s rights undermines the economic incentive to continue investing in the creation of new works . . . and deprives society of the benefit of new and expressive works of authorship.” The resulting Copyright Office report documents “the challenges of resolving small copyright claims in the current legal system” and observes that the problem of enforcing modest-sized copyright claims “appears to be especially acute for individual creators,” and recommends the creation of a small claims tribunal within the Copyright Office.

3. **Please Explain How the Proposed Policy Position Will Address the Issue**

   The Resolution supports legislation creating the establishment of a Copyright Small Claims Program, and supports including in such legislation appropriate procedures and requirements, including those listed in the Resolution.

4. **Summary of Minority Views or Opposition Internal and/or External to the ABA Which Have Been Identified**

   No known opposition.
JOINT SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT MUSIC AND FUTURE OF MUSIC COALITION IN RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

The American Association of Independent Music (“A2IM”) and the Future of Music Coalition (“FMC”) are pleased to provide the following study results in response to the Copyright Office’s request for empirical research in connection with the Office’s Section 512 Study, submitted by Kevin Erickson of FMC.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A2IM and FMC asked independent record labels to respond to a survey asking about their experiences with unauthorized online uses of their sound recordings and their experience with the DMCA. Based on the responses to that survey:

• 87% of the respondents knew of online infringements of their works, even though 30% did not actively search for infringements of their works.
• 65% of the respondents who took action to have the infringing works removed from an online source reported that either it took longer than 24 hours for the infringing work to be removed or that the infringing work was never removed.
• 68% of the respondents reported that an infringing copy of their music reappeared on the same service even after that music had previously been taken down—the so-called “whack-a-mole” problem.
• 65% of those that did not actively search for unauthorized use attributed the reason to not having enough resources to search for infringing activity. In addition, 30% of the respondents also stated that they did not continue searching for infringements because previous enforcement efforts had been unsuccessful.
• The three most frequently cited obstacles faced by the respondents in enforcing their rights online include that (i) they don’t have enough resources to pursue infringement of their works. (ii) they can’t find the contact information to request takedown, (iii) the sites ignore notices or other complaints.
Survey Methodology

The survey consisted of 10 questions, which were either in the form of multiple choice, or “check all that apply.” (See appendix for survey questions). Participants provided anonymous information about their companies’ experiences and typical practices. Data collection via Survey Monkey began on March 8, 2017 and closed March 16, 2017.

Invitations were distributed to A2IM’s independent label members and additional independent labels from FMC’s networks. In all, 73 companies responded to the survey; all but one identified themselves as from a company that derives income from sound recordings. Because a single company can release recordings under multiple label names, or house multiple label divisions, this survey does not attempt to quantify just how many labels are represented in the dataset.

Risks and Limitations

Research that uses web-based surveys can be implemented quickly, and allows for the automation of much of the data processing. We do, however, recognize the inherent limitations of such surveys. We recognize the problem of defining our population of study, as companies that comprise the independent label sector are very diverse in their scale, operations, goals, and business models. Some labels operate as master rights owners, others as licensees, and many are operated by artists themselves. There can be no complete and accurate count of precisely how many independent labels exist in the US. Between our two organizations, we are able to access insights from a very broad array of companies, from tiny businesses focused on documenting local music communities to large and internationally recognized firms with broad commercial appeal. Yet because this survey does not include collection of detailed demographic information, we are unable to examine differences between different kinds of labels.

Additionally, we recognize the risk of self-selection bias in a survey like this. It is possible that labels who face perennial frustrations with the DMCA may be most likely to feel compelled to respond to surveys about their notice and takedown practices. Alternatively, it is possible that companies who feel most invested in leaving the DMCA untouched might feel especially motivated to respond. We made it clear in our communications to potential participants that we wanted to hear from as many labels as possible.

Finally, more study is needed to fully assess practices of services that use proprietary audio identification technologies, how well independent labels are served by this, and the terms under which independent labels are allowed to access such systems. This survey focuses on unlicensed content; it does not speak directly to certain issues with platforms where content is licensed, but these licenses may be procured from reluctant rightsholders at below-market rates because of the shortcomings of current §512 implementation.

A2IM/FMC: Section 512
FINDINGS

Awareness of Online Infringing Activities

A supermajority of companies surveyed are aware that their music is being infringed online. 87% of the respondents (61/70) reported that they knew of unauthorized uses of their works in any typical 3 month period.

Of those aware of online infringement of their works 46% (28/61) knew their works were being infringed at least weekly.

Of those aware of online infringement of their works 46% (28/61) knew their works were being infringed at least weekly.

This awareness existed even though 30% of the companies surveyed (21/69) report that they do not proactively search for online infringements of their works.
Impact of Take Down Requests

Upon discovering an unauthorized use, different companies may choose from a range of possible responses based on a variety of factors. (Answers do not add to 100% because a company may have more than one typical response.)

18% of those surveyed (12/66) reported an infringing work was removed within 24 hours of sending a takedown notice or taking similar action. Conversely, a majority (51.5% - 34/66) reported that it took over 24 hours for the infringing work to be removed from the service after notice, and an additional 13.6% (9/66) reported that the infringing work was never removed.

18% of those surveyed (12/66) reported an infringing work was removed within 24 hours of sending a takedown notice or taking similar action. Conversely, a majority (51.5% - 34/66) reported that it took over 24 hours for the infringing work to be removed from the service after notice, and an additional 13.6% (9/66) reported that the infringing work was never removed.
In addition, 68% of the respondents (45/66) reported seeing infringing copy of their work reappear on the same service.

**Obstacles Faced by Companies in Using DMCA Take Down Processes**

Of those companies surveyed that do not actively search for unauthorized uses of their works, the most frequent reasons cited for not doing so included not having enough resources to engage in such enforcement activities (65% - 13/20) and that previous attempts to address unauthorized uses had been had been unsuccessful (30% - 6/20). No companies selected the response “we are not bothered by unauthorized uses of our sound recordings”, though one respondent used the “other” response box to draw a more subtle distinction: “as long as they’re not monetizing it (or using it to sell products), we’re not particularly concerned.” (Values do not add to 100% because multiple answers were permitted.)
Among all respondents, the three most frequently cited obstacles faced by companies in their attempts to remove their music from unauthorized services include that (i) they don’t have enough resources to pursue infringement of their works (77% - 51/66) (ii) they can’t find the contact information to request takedown (51% 34/66) and (iii) sites ignore their takedown notices or other complaints (45% 30/66).

A2IM/FMC: Section 512
Analysis and Recommendations

These results confirm that independent labels face significant practical challenges in using the notice and takedown system to exercise meaningful control over where and how their sound recordings are used. When they use the process, they may encounter frustrations not only with the near term results but also with the ineffectiveness of the notice and takedown process to significantly deter infringing activity. As we have seen, a significant portion of independent labels surveyed have abandoned enforcement online, but generally not because they don’t view unauthorized use as a problem.

As FMC noted in its additional comments previously submitted, care should be taken in developing copyright policy to align the interests of those engaged in cultural production and those that listen and engage with that music, as ultimately both are interested in stimulating artistic creativity for the public good. However, these results suggest that current implementation of DMCA has fallen short of that goal.

Several non-legislative and legislative solutions have been proposed by various actors within the music community to help address these challenges. In particular, we encourage you to consider possible solutions referenced in both the FMC and A2IM filings that address the unique needs of the independent music sector, which is responsible for sustaining and advancing so many of America’s precious musical traditions.
Appendix: Survey Questions

1. Does your company derive income from sound recordings, such as through sales of physical products like CDs, through digital downloads, or through ad-supported or paid streaming services?
   - Yes
   - No (end survey)
   - I don’t know. (end survey)

2. During a typical 3-month period, which of the following best describes the frequency with which you find or learn of recordings your company owns or administers available from online sources you believe to be unauthorized (i.e. they do not pay you or your designated agents for use of your recordings)
   - Never
   - Less than once per month
   - Once or a few times per month
   - Once or a few times per week
   - Once a day or more often

3. Do you actively try to find (on the internet) unauthorized uses of sound recordings that your company owns or administers? (Check all that apply)
   - Yes, my company does this directly
   - My company directly employs, relies on or otherwise engage other people, vendors, programs or organizations to do this on our behalf
   - No
   - I don’t know
4. Why does your company not actively search for unauthorized uses? (Please check all that apply) (asked only of those who answered “No” on question 3)

- We don’t know how to do this.
- People are not making unauthorized use of our sound recordings
- We are not bothered by unauthorized use of our sound recordings
- Not enough resources (money or employee time) to pursue unauthorized sources
- Previous attempts to address unauthorized uses have been unsuccessful
- Other (please specify)

5. How many hours per week does your company spend searching for unauthorized uses of your sound recordings?

- 0
- <5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- My company employs at least one full-time employee to devote to anti-theft efforts

6. On an annual basis, how much money does your company spend on anti-theft efforts?

- $0
- $1-$5000
- $5,001-$10,000
- $10,000-$50,000
- >$50,000

7. What do you or those searching on your behalf typically do when they find your music available from unauthorized sources? (Check all that typically apply)

- Send DMCA notice to service where that music was found
- Contact distributing label or entity (if distributed by another company)
- Contact the unauthorized site but not with a standard DMCA takedown request
- Nothing
- Other (please specify)
8. What results most typically occur after you take steps regarding the unauthorized music available?
   - Nothing (music remains available)
   - The unauthorized music is removed promptly (within 24 hours)
   - The unauthorized music is removed, but takes longer than 24 hours
   - I receive counterclaims that the music is non-infringing
   - Other (please specify)

9. Have you had music that was taken down, but then reappears on the same source (website, app, etc)
   - No
   - Yes, rarely.
   - Yes, some of the time.
   - Yes, most of the time.
   - Yes, all of the time.
   - I don’t know

10. In your recent experience, what are the most common obstacles you face in trying to remove your company's music from unauthorized sites?
    - Can’t find where to contact site to request takedown
    - Can’t determine where sites are located
    - Sites ignore notices or other complaints
    - Not enough resources (money or employee time) to pursue unauthorized sources
    - Music reappears nearly immediately after it has been removed
    - Other (please specify)
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Summary

The Senate “hold” is an informal practice whereby Senators communicate to Senate leaders, often in the form of a letter, their policy views and scheduling preferences regarding measures and matters available for floor consideration. Unique to the upper chamber, holds can be understood as information-sharing devices predicated on the unanimous consent nature of Senate decision-making. Senators place holds to accomplish a variety of purposes—to receive notification of upcoming legislative proceedings, for instance, or to express objections to a particular proposal or executive nomination—but ultimately the decision to honor a hold request, and for how long, rests with the majority leader. Scheduling Senate business is the fundamental prerogative of the majority leader, and this responsibility is typically carried out in consultation with the minority leader.

The influence that holds exert in chamber deliberations is based primarily upon the significant parliamentary prerogatives individual Senators are afforded in the rules, procedures, and precedents of the chamber. More often than not, Senate leaders honor a hold request because not doing so could trigger a range of parliamentary responses from the holding Senator(s), such as a filibuster, that could expend significant amounts of scarce floor time. As such, efforts to regulate holds are inextricably linked with the chamber’s use of unanimous consent agreements to structure the process of calling up measures and matters for floor debate and amendment.

In recent years the Senate has considered a variety of proposals that address the Senate hold, two of which the chamber adopted. Both sought to eliminate the secrecy of holds. Prior to these rules changes, hold letters were written with the expectation that their source and contents would remain private, even to other Senators.

In 2007, the Senate adopted new procedures to make hold requests public in certain circumstances. Under Section 512 of the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act (P.L. 110-81), if objection was raised to a unanimous consent request to proceed to or pass a measure or matter on behalf of another Senator, then the Senator who originated the hold was expected to deliver for publication in the Congressional Record, within six session days of the objection, a “notice of intent to object” identifying the Senator as the source of the hold and the measure or matter to which it pertained. A process for removing a hold was also created, and a new “Notice of Intent to Object” section was added to both Senate calendars to take account of objection notices that remained outstanding.

An examination of objection notices published since 2007 suggests that many hold requests are likely to have fallen outside the scope of Section 512 regulation. In an effort to make public a greater share of hold requests, the Senate adjusted its notification requirements by way of a standing order (S.Res. 28) adopted at the outset of the 112th Congress (2011-2012). Instead of the six session day reporting window specified in Section 512, S.Res. 28 provides two days of session during which Senators are expected to deliver their objection notices for publication. The action that triggers the reporting requirement also shifted: from an objection on the basis of a colleague’s hold request (under Section 512) to the initial transmission of a written objection notice to the party leader (under S.Res. 28). In the event that a Senator neglects to deliver an objection notice for publication and a party leader nevertheless raises objection on the basis of that hold, S.Res. 28 requires that the name of the objecting party leader be identified as the source of the hold in the “Notice of Intent to Object” section of the appropriate Senate calendar.
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Background

Senate rules, procedures, and precedents give significant parliamentary power to individual Senators during the course of chamber deliberations. Many decisions the Senate makes—from routine requests for additional debate time, to determinations of how legislation will be considered on the floor—are arrived at by unanimous consent. When a unanimous consent request is proposed on the floor, any Senator may object to it. If objection is heard, the consent request does not take effect. Efforts to modify the original request may be undertaken—a process that can require extensive negotiations between and among Senate leaders and their colleagues—but there is no guarantee that a particular objection can be addressed to the satisfaction of all Senators.¹

The Senate hold emerges from within this context of unanimous-consent decision-making as a method of transmitting policy or scheduling preferences to Senate leaders regarding matters available for floor consideration.² Many hold requests take the form of a letter addressed to the majority or minority leader (depending on the party affiliation of the Senator placing the hold) expressing reservations about the merits or timing of a particular policy proposal or nomination. An example of a hold letter is displayed in Appendix A.

More often than not, Senate leaders—as agents of their party responsible for defending the political, policy, and procedural interests of their colleagues—honor a hold request because not doing so could trigger a range of parliamentary responses from the holding Senator(s), such as a filibuster, that could expend significant amounts of scarce floor time.³ Unless the target of a hold is of considerable importance to the majority leader and a supermajority of his colleagues—60 of whom might be required to invoke cloture on legislation under Senate Rule XXII—the most practical course of action is often to lay the matter aside and attempt to promote negotiations that could alleviate the concerns that gave rise to the hold.⁴ With hold-inspired negotiations underway, the Senate can turn its attention to more broadly-supported matters.⁵

Types of Holds

Holds can be used to accomplish a variety of purposes. Although the Senate itself makes no official distinctions among holds, scholars have classified holds based on the objective of the communication.⁶ Informational holds, for instance, request that the Senator be notified or

---

¹ For information on unanimous consent agreements, see CRS Report RL33939, The Rise of Senate Unanimous Consent Agreements, by Walter J. Oleszek.

² Senate leaders play an organizational role in the chamber by representing the interests and views of party colleagues during negotiations with one another over scheduling legislation and nominations for floor consideration.

³ The linkages that exist among holds, filibusters, and the cloture process are described in CRS Report RL30360, Filibusters and Cloture in the Senate, by Richard S. Beth and Valerie Heitshusen.

⁴ Senate leaders can act as intermediaries between Senators who place holds and bill sponsors who want to move legislation forward. Leaders may also negotiate directly with holding Senators for potential future consideration.

⁵ As the Senate’s chief scheduler, if unanimous consent to proceed to or pass a measure or matter cannot be obtained, the majority leader maintains the right to offer a motion to proceed to consider. This alternative method of bringing measures and matters to the floor can require the use of cloture, especially on items subjected to a hold. For information on the motion to proceed, see CRS Report RS21255, Motions to Proceed to Consider Measures in the Senate: Who Offers Them?, by Richard S. Beth and Mark J. Oleszek.

⁶ See C. Lawrence Evans and Daniel Lipinski, “Holds, Legislation, and the Senate Parties,” (prepared for delivery at the Conference on Senate Parties, University of Oxford, April 1-3, 2005) for an analysis of holds placed during the tenure of Republican Leader Howard Baker. For an account of hold operations during the period when Robert Dole (continued...)
consulted in advance of any floor action to be taken on a particular measure or matter, perhaps to allow the Senator to plan for floor debate or the offering of amendments. *Choke* holds contain an explicit filibuster threat and are intended to kill or delay action on the target of the hold. *Blanket* holds are leveled against an entire category of business, such as all nominations to a particular agency or department. *Mae West* holds intend to foster negotiation and bargaining between proponents and opponents. *Retaliatory* holds are placed as political payback against a colleague or administration, while *rolling* (or *rotating*) holds are defined by coordinated action involving two or more Senators who place holds on a measure or matter on an alternating basis. Until recently, many holds were considered *anonymous* (or *secret*) because the source and contents of the request were not made available to the public, or even to other Senators.

**Recent Efforts to Regulate Holds**

Written hold requests emerged as an informal practice in the late 1950s under the majority leadership of Lyndon B. Johnson as a way for Senators to make routine requests of their leaders regarding the Senate’s schedule. Early usage was largely consistent with prevailing expectations of Senate behavior at that time, such as reciprocity, deference, and accommodation of one’s Senate colleagues. Over time, holds have evolved to become a potent extra-parliamentary practice, sometimes likened to a “silent filibuster” in the press. “The hold started out as a courtesy for senators who wanted to participate in open debate,” two Senators wrote in 1997. Since then, “it has become a shield for senators who wish to avoid it.” These and other Senators were concerned that keeping holds confidential tended to enable Senators who placed holds to block measures or nominations while leaving no avenue of recourse open to their supporters. Accordingly, rather than restricting the process itself, recent attempts to alter the operation of holds have focused on making the secrecy of holds less absolute.

The Senate has considered a variety of proposals targeting the Senate hold in recent years, two of which the chamber adopted. Both sought to eliminate the secrecy of holds by creating a process through which holds—formally referred to in the new rules as “notices of intent to object to proceeding”—would be made public within some period of time if certain criteria were met. Prior to these rules changes, hold letters were written with the expectation that they would be treated as private correspondences between a Senator and his or her party leader.

(...continued)

served as Republican Leader, see Nicholas Howard and Jason Roberts, “The Politics of Obstruction: Republican Holds in the U.S. Senate,” *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 2 (May 2015), pp. 273-294. Both studies draw upon archival research conducted by the authors using the personal papers of former Republican Leaders Howard Baker and Robert Dole (respectively) and are available online at: http://wmpeople.wm.edu/asset/index/clevan/oxford and http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/lsq.12076/epdf.

7 In the Hollywood production *She Done Him Wrong* (1933), actress Mae West asks of her co-star Cary Grant: “Why don’t you come up sometime and see me?” A similar motivation—to have a bill sponsor visit the holding Senator’s office to negotiate the removal of the hold—defines a *Mae West* hold.

8 On the evolution of Senate hold practices, see Gregory Koger, *Filibustering* (University of Chicago Press, 2010).

9 See Donald R. Matthews, *U.S. Senators and Their World* (University of North Carolina Press, 1960) for an account of chamber norms and expectations of behavior during the 1950s.

Notification Procedures Established by Section 512 of P.L. 110-81

The first proposal, enacted in 2007 as Section 512 of the Honest Leadership and Open Government Act (P.L. 110-81), established new reporting requirements that were designed to take effect if either the majority or minority leader or their designees, acting on behalf of a party colleague on the basis of a hold letter previously received, objected to a unanimous consent request to advance a measure or matter to the Senate floor for consideration or passage. If objection was raised on the basis of a hold letter, then the Senator who originated the hold was expected to submit a “notice of intent to object” to his or her party leader and, within six days of session thereafter, deliver the objection notice to the Legislative Clerk for publication in both the Congressional Record and the Senate’s Calendar of Business (or, if the hold pertained to a nomination, the Executive Calendar).

Under Section 512, objection notices were to take the following form: “I, Senator ___, intend to object to proceeding to ____, dated ___ for the following reasons ___. To accommodate the publication of these notices, a new “Notice of Intent to Object to Proceeding” section was added to both Senate calendars as shown in Appendix B. Each calendar entry contained four pieces of information: (1) the bill or nomination number to which the hold pertained; (2) the official title of the bill or nomination; (3) the date on which the hold was placed; and (4) the name of the Senator who placed the hold. Publication was not required if a Senator withdrew the hold within six session days of triggering the notification requirement.11 Once published, an objection notice could be removed from future editions of a calendar by submitting for inclusion in the Congressional Record the following statement: “I, Senator ___, do not object to proceed to ____, dated ___.”

On October 3, 2007, roughly two weeks after the new disclosure procedures were signed into law, the first notice of an intent to object was published in the Congressional Record.12 A total of 5 such notices appeared during the 110th Congress (2007-2008), and 12 were published during the 111th Congress (2009-2010), but these numbers should not be interpreted to reflect the entirety of hold activity that occurred during those two Congresses.13 Instead, they represent the subset of holds that activated the notification requirements established in Section 512 of P.L. 110-81. Recall that notification is required when three conditions are met: (1) the majority or minority leader (or their designee) asks unanimous consent to proceed to or pass a measure or matter; (2) objection is raised on the basis of a colleague’s hold letter; and (3) six days of session have elapsed since the objection was made.

Many holds lodged during the 110th and 111th Congresses (2007-2010) are likely to have fallen outside the purview of Section 512 regulation. At least two reasons account for this. First, the new notification requirements would not apply to holds placed on measures or matters the Senate did not attempt to proceed to or pass (perhaps on account of an implicit filibuster threat contained in a hold letter). When scheduling business for floor consideration, the content and quantity of hold

---

11 Some Senators announce their holds on the Senate floor at the time they are placed. If a hold is made public in this way, then the Senator is exempt from the formal procedures described in this report.
12 The inaugural notice came in connection to S. 233, a bill that would have required Senate candidates to file election-related statements and reports in electronic form.
13 This number is likely to understate the total number of holds placed during the 110th and 111th Congresses by at least one order of magnitude in comparison to historical rates of hold activity. For instance, between 1985 and 1996, Nicholas Howard and Jason Roberts identify 2655 unique hold requests made of Republican Leader Robert Dole, an average of about 220 per year. Evans and Lipinski find similar rates of hold activity during the tenure of Republican Leader Howard Baker.
letters received on a particular measure or matter are likely to factor into the negotiations and considerations Senate leaders make. Rather than take action that could have the effect of vitiating the confidentiality of a holding Senator, Senate leaders might simply decide to advance other matters to the floor instead (or at least try to).

A second reason the actual number of holds is likely to exceed the number published in the Record during these two Congresses has to do with the six session day window between an objection being raised and reporting requirements becoming mandatory. Designed to provide Senators with sufficient time to study an issue before deciding whether or not to maintain a hold beyond the six session day grace period, this provision may have encouraged the use of revolving (or rotating) holds. If one Senator removes his or her hold within six session days of activating the reporting requirement and another Senator puts a new hold in its place, the effect would be to reset the six session day clock each time a new hold was placed on a given measure or matter. In this way, two or more Senators could maintain the secrecy of their holds for an indefinite period without running afoul of the new disclosure procedures.

Notification Procedures Established by S.Res. 28 (2011)

In response to the limited applicability of Section 512, the Senate established—by a 92-4 vote on January 27, 2011—a standing order (S.Res. 28) that extends notification requirements to a larger share of hold activity. Instead of a six day reporting window, S.Res. 28 provides two days of session during which Senators are expected to deliver their objection notices for publication. The action that triggers the reporting requirement also changed: from an objection on the basis of a colleague’s hold request (under Section 512) to the initial transmission of a written objection notice to the party leader (under S.Res. 28).

The proper language to communicate a hold remained largely the same as before, except that holding Senators must now include a statement that expressly authorizes their party leader to object to a unanimous consent request in their name. In the event that a Senator neglects to deliver an objection notice for publication within two session days and a party leader nevertheless raises objection on the basis of that hold, S.Res. 28 requires that the name of the objecting party leader be identified as the source of the hold in the “Notice of Intent to Object” section of the appropriate Senate calendar. The process of removing an objection notice from either calendar remains unchanged.

During the 112th Congress (2011-2012), a total of 24 objection notices were published in accordance with the provisions of S.Res. 28. Nine notices were printed during the 113th Congress (2013-2014), and 34 were published in the 114th Congress (2015-2016). See Appendix C for an example of how these notices appear in the Congressional Record. As before, caution should be exercised when interpreting these numbers. What looks like a drop-off in the use of holds could instead reflect broader challenges inherent in efforts to regulate this kind of communication.

14 S.Res. 28 specifies the following language hold letters should take: “I, Senator ___, intend to object to ___, dated ___. I will submit a copy of this notice to the Legislative Clerk and the Congressional Record within 2 session days and I give my permission to the objecting Senator to object in my name.” Notice that the new form no longer requires a Senator to give reason for the hold.

15 To date, no Senate leader has been identified as the source of a hold on the basis of this provision.

16 Twenty-nine of the 34 objection notices issued during the 114th Congress (2015-2016) came from one Senator; 21 of the 29 concerned individual promotions within the Foreign Service. Appointments and promotions to the Foreign Service are typically submitted on lists and assigned a single presidential nomination (PN) number. The 21 promotions subjected to a written objection notice during the 114th Congress were presented to the Senate as a single list.
Challenges Inherent in Regulating Hold Activity

Senate holds are predicated on the unanimous consent nature of Senate decision-making. The influence they exert in chamber deliberations is based primarily upon the significant parliamentary prerogatives individual Senators are afforded in the rules, procedures, and precedents of the chamber. As such, efforts to regulate holds are inextricably linked with the chamber’s use of unanimous consent agreements to structure the process of calling up measures and matters for floor debate and amendment. While not all holds are intended to prevent the consideration of a particular measure, some do take that form, and Senate leaders justifiably perceive those correspondences as implicit filibuster threats.

As agents of their party, Senate leaders value the information that holds provide regarding the policy and scheduling preferences of their colleagues. For this reason, rules changes that require enforcement on the part of Senate leaders—as both efforts discussed here do—tend to conflict with the managerial role played by contemporary Senate leaders and the expectation on the part of their colleagues that leaders will defend their interests in negotiations over the scheduling of measures and matters for floor consideration.\textsuperscript{17}

A second challenge to hold regulation involves the nature of the transmission itself. Both recent proposals address a particular kind of communication: a letter written and delivered to a Senator’s party leader that expresses some kind of reservation about the timing or merits of a particular proposal or nomination. Hold requests might be conveyed in less formal ways as well; in a telephone call to the leader’s office, for instance, or in a verbal exchange that occurs on or off the Senate floor. An objection to a unanimous consent request transmitted through the “hotline” represents another common method of communicating preferences to Senate leaders.\textsuperscript{18} Some Senate offices have circulated “Dear Colleague” letters specifying certain requirements legislation must adhere to in order to avoid a hold being placed. It remains unclear, however, whether or not these alternative forms of communication fall within the purview of recent hold reforms.

\textsuperscript{17} See §512(a) of P.L. 110-81 and §1(a)(2) of S.Res. 28 (2011). Both sections include language specifying that Senate leaders only recognize hold requests that comport with the new disclosure requirements.

\textsuperscript{18} The “hotline” is a special telephone and email system that connects Senate offices to the majority and minority cloakrooms. Senate leaders use the hotline to transmit notifications and unanimous consent requests regarding the Senate’s legislative agenda and schedule.
Appendix A. A Hold Letter¹⁹

JOHN ASHCROFT
MISSOURI

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-2504

September 27, 1995

The Honorable Bob Dole
Majority Leader
United States Senate
S-230 The Capitol
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Bob:

I will object to any time agreement or unanimous consent request with respect to consideration of H.R. 2127, Calendar Order Number 189, an act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

Many thanks and kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

John Ashcroft

¹⁹ This hold letter is drawn from archival research conducted by scholars Nicholas Howard and Jason Roberts. Additional examples of hold letters can be found in their conference paper entitled “Holding Up the Senate: Bob Dole and the Politics of Holds in the U.S. Senate,” op. cit.
Appendix B. The "Notice of Intent to Object" section of the Calendar of Business

### NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT

When a notice of intent to object is given to the appropriate leader, or their designee, and such notice is submitted for inclusion in the Congressional Record and the Senate Calendar of Business, or following the objection to a unanimous consent to proceeding to, and, or disposition of, a measure or matter on their behalf, it shall be placed in the section of the Calendar entitled "Notice of Intent to Object". (S. Res. 28, 112th Congress)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DATE AND SENATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 359</td>
<td>An act to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions.</td>
<td>Feb. 14, 2011.—Mr. Kyl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 359</td>
<td>An act to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of presidential election campaigns and party conventions.</td>
<td>Feb. 14, 2011.—Mr. DeMint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 520</td>
<td>A bill to repeal the Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit.</td>
<td>June 7, 2011.—Mr. Grassley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 530</td>
<td>A bill to modify certain subsidies for ethanol production, and for other purposes.</td>
<td>June 7, 2011.—Mr. Grassley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 871</td>
<td>A bill to repeal the Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit.</td>
<td>June 7, 2011.—Mr. Grassley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 1057</td>
<td>A bill to repeal the Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit.</td>
<td>June 7, 2011.—Mr. Grassley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 1145</td>
<td>A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify and expand Federal criminal jurisdiction over Federal contractors and employees outside the United States, and for other purposes.</td>
<td>June 28, 2011.—Mr. Grassley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 618</td>
<td>A bill to promote the strengthening of the private sector in Egypt and Tunisia.</td>
<td>June 29, 2011.—Mr. Coburn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 1385</td>
<td>A bill to terminate the $1 presidential coin program.</td>
<td>Oct. 17, 2011.—Mr. Grassley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 1014</td>
<td>A bill to provide for additional Federal district judgeships.</td>
<td>Nov. 2, 2011.—Mr. Grassley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 1793</td>
<td>A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to clarify the statutory authority for the longstanding practice of the Department of Justice of providing investigatory assistance on request of State and local authorities with respect to certain serious violent crimes, and for other purposes.</td>
<td>Nov. 17, 2011.—Mr. Grassley.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

20 Calendar of Business, December 27, 2012, p. 82.
Appendix C. A Notice of Intent to Object²¹

Listing cooperative procedures (including
memoranda of understanding)—

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO
PROCEEDING

I, Senator CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, intend to object to proceeding to S. 2415, a bill to implement integrity measures to strengthen the EB-5 Regional Center Program in order to promote and reform foreign capital investment and job creation in American communities; dated January 28, 2016.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO
MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

Author Contact Information

Mark J. Oleszek
Analyst on Congress and the Legislative Process
moleszek@crs.loc.gov, 7-7084

AN ACT

To amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Copyright Alternative in Small-Claims Enforcement Act of 2019” or the “CASE Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. COPYRIGHT SMALL CLAIMS.

(a) In General.—Title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:
“CHAPTER 15—COPYRIGHT SMALL CLAIMS

§ 1501. Definitions

“In this chapter—

“(1) the term ‘party”—

“(A) means a party; and

“(B) includes the attorney of a party, as applicable;

“(2) the term ‘claimant’ means the real party in interest that commences a proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board under section 1506(e), pursuant to a permissible claim of infringement brought under section 1504(c)(1), noninfringement brought under section 1504(c)(2), or misrepresentation brought under section 1504(c)(3);”

“(3) the term ‘counterclaimant’ means a respondent in a proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board that—
“(A) asserts a permissible counterclaim under section 1504(c)(4) against the claimant in the proceeding; and

“(B) is the real party in interest with respect to the counterclaim described in subparagraph (A); and

“(4) the term ‘respondent’ means any person against whom a proceeding is brought before the Copyright Claims Board under section 1506(e), pursuant to a permissible claim of infringement brought under section 1504(c)(1), noninfringement brought under section 1504(c)(2), or misrepresentation brought under section 1504(c)(3).

“§ 1502. Copyright Claims Board

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Copyright Office the Copyright Claims Board, which shall serve as an alternative forum in which parties may voluntarily seek to resolve certain copyright claims regarding any category of copyrighted work, as provided in this chapter.

“(b) OFFICERS AND STAFF.—

“(1) COPYRIGHT CLAIMS OFFICERS.—The Register of Copyrights shall recommend three full-time Copyright Claims Officers to serve on the Copyright Claims Board in accordance with paragraph (3)(A). The Officers shall be appointed by the Librarian of
Congress to such positions after consultation with the Register of Copyrights.

“(2) COPYRIGHT CLAIMS ATTORNEYS.—The Register of Copyrights shall hire not fewer than two full-time Copyright Claims Attorneys to assist in the administration of the Copyright Claims Board.

“(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—

“(A) COPYRIGHT CLAIMS OFFICERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each Copyright Claims Officer shall be an attorney who has not fewer than 7 years of legal experience.

“(ii) EXPERIENCE.—Two of the Copyright Claims Officers shall have—

“(I) substantial experience in the evaluation, litigation, or adjudication of copyright infringement claims; and

“(II) between those two Officers, have represented or presided over a diversity of copyright interests, including those of both owners and users of copyrighted works.

“(iii) ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION.—The Copyright Claims Officer not described in clause (ii) shall have substan-
tial familiarity with copyright law and ex-
perience in the field of alternative dispute
resolution, including the resolution of liti-
gation matters through that method of res-
olution.

“(B) COPYRIGHT CLAIMS ATTORNEYS.—

Each Copyright Claims Attorney shall be an at-
torney who has not fewer than 3 years of sub-
stantial experience in copyright law.

“(4) COMPENSATION.—

“(A) COPYRIGHT CLAIMS OFFICERS.—

“(i) DEFINITION.—In this subpara-
graph, the term ‘senior level employee of
the Federal Government’ means an em-
ployee, other than an employee in the Sen-
ior Executive Service, the position of whom
is classified above GS–15 of the General
Schedule.

“(ii) PAY RANGE.—Each Copyright
Claims Officer shall be compensated at a
rate of pay that is not less than the min-
imum, and not more than the maximum,
rate of pay payable for senior level employ-
ees of the Federal Government, including
locality pay, as applicable.
“(B) Copyright claims attorneys.—
Each Copyright Claims Attorney shall be compensated at a rate of pay that is not more than the maximum rate of pay payable for level 10 of GS–15 of the General Schedule, including locality pay, as applicable.

“(5) Terms.—

“(A) In general.—Subject to subparagraph (B), a Copyright Claims Officer shall serve for a renewable term of 6 years.

“(B) Initial terms.—The terms for the first Copyright Claims Officers appointed under this chapter shall be as follows:

“(i) The first such Copyright Claims Officer appointed shall be appointed for a term of 4 years.

“(ii) The second Copyright Claims Officer appointed shall be appointed for a term of 5 years.

“(iii) The third Copyright Claims Officer appointed shall be appointed for a term of 6 years.

“(6) Vacancies and incapacity.—

“(A) Vacancy.—
“(i) IN GENERAL.—If a vacancy occurs in the position of a Copyright Claims Officer, the Librarian of Congress shall, upon the recommendation of and in consultation with the Register of Copyrights, act expeditiously to appoint a Copyright Claims Officer for that position.

“(ii) VACANCY BEFORE EXPIRATION.—An individual appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the predecessor of the individual was appointed shall be appointed to serve a 6-year term.

“(B) INCAPACITY.—If a Copyright Claims Officer is temporarily unable to perform the duties of the Officer, the Librarian of Congress shall, upon recommendation of and in consultation with the Register of Copyrights, act expeditiously to appoint an interim Copyright Claims Officer to perform such duties during the period of such incapacity.

“(7) SANCTION OR REMOVAL.—Subject to section 1503(b), the Librarian of Congress may sanction or remove a Copyright Claims Officer.
“(8) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.—The Register of Copyrights shall provide the Copyright Claims Officers and Copyright Claims Attorneys with necessary administrative support, including technological facilities, to carry out the duties of the Officers and Attorneys under this chapter.

“(9) LOCATION OF COPYRIGHT CLAIMS BOARD.—The offices and facilities of the Copyright Claims Officers and Copyright Claims Attorneys shall be located at the Copyright Office.

“§ 1503. Authority and duties of the Copyright Claims Board

“(a) FUNCTIONS.—

“(1) COPYRIGHT CLAIMS OFFICERS.—Subject to the provisions of this chapter and applicable regulations, the functions of the Copyright Claims Officers shall be as follows:

“(A) To render determinations on the civil copyright claims, counterclaims, and defenses that may be brought before the Officers under this chapter.

“(B) To ensure that claims, counterclaims, and defenses are properly asserted and otherwise appropriate for resolution by the Copyright Claims Board.
“(C) To manage the proceedings before the Officers and render rulings pertaining to the consideration of claims, counterclaims, and defenses, including with respect to scheduling, discovery, evidentiary, and other matters.

“(D) To request, from participants and nonparticipants in a proceeding, the production of information and documents relevant to the resolution of a claim, counterclaim, or defense.

“(E) To conduct hearings and conferences.

“(F) To facilitate the settlement by the parties of claims and counterclaims.

“(G)(i) To award monetary relief; and

“(ii) to include in the determinations of the Officers a requirement that certain activities under section 1504(e)(2) cease or be mitigated, if the party to undertake the applicable measure has so agreed.

“(H) To provide information to the public concerning the procedures and requirements of the Copyright Claims Board.

“(I) To maintain records of the proceedings before the Officers, certify official records of such proceedings as needed, and, as
provided in section 1506(t), make the records
in such proceedings available to the public.

“(J) To carry out such other duties as are
set forth in this chapter.

“(K) When not engaged in performing the
duties of the Officers set forth in this chapter,
to perform such other duties as may be as-
signed by the Register of Copyrights.

“(2) COPYRIGHT CLAIMS ATTORNEYS.—Subject
to the provisions of this chapter and applicable regu-
lations, the functions of the Copyright Claims Attor-
neys shall be as follows:

“(A) To provide assistance to the Copy-
right Claims Officers in the administration of
the duties of those Officers under this chapter.

“(B) To provide assistance to members of
the public with respect to the procedures and
requirements of the Copyright Claims Board.

“(C) To provide information to potential
claimants contemplating bringing a permissible
action before the Copyright Claims Board about
obtaining a subpoena under section 512(h) for
the sole purpose of identifying a potential re-
respondent in such an action.
“(D) When not engaged in performing the duties of the Attorneys set forth in this chapter, to perform such other duties as may be assigned by the Register of Copyrights.

“(b) INDEPENDENCE IN DETERMINATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Copyright Claims Board shall render the determinations of the Board in individual proceedings independently on the basis of the records in the proceedings before it and in accordance with the provisions of this title, judicial precedent, and applicable regulations of the Register of Copyrights.

“(2) CONSULTATION.—The Copyright Claims Officers and Copyright Claims Attorneys—

“(A) may consult with the Register of Copyrights on general issues of law; and

“(B) subject to section 1506(x), may not consult with the Register of Copyrights with respect to—

“(i) the facts of any particular matter pending before the Officers and the Attorneys; or

“(ii) the application of law to the facts described in clause (i).
“(3) Performance Appraisals.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any regulation or policy of the Library of Congress or Register of Copyrights, any performance appraisal of a Copyright Claims Officer or Copyright Claims Attorney may not consider the substantive result of any individual determination reached by the Copyright Claims Board as a basis for appraisal except to the extent that result may relate to any actual or alleged violation of an ethical standard of conduct.

“(c) Direction by Register.—Subject to subsection (b), the Copyright Claims Officers and Copyright Claims Attorneys shall, in the administration of their duties, be under the general direction of the Register of Copyrights.

“(d) Inconsistent Duties Barred.—A Copyright Claims Officer or Copyright Claims Attorney may not undertake any duty that conflicts with the duties of the Officer or Attorney in connection with the Copyright Claims Board.

“(e) Recusal.—A Copyright Claims Officer or Copyright Claims Attorney shall recuse himself or herself from participation in any proceeding with respect to which the Copyright Claims Officer or Copyright Claims Attorney,
as the case may be, has reason to believe that he or she has a conflict of interest.

“(f) Ex Parte Communications.—Except as may otherwise be permitted by applicable law, any party to a proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board shall refrain from ex parte communications with the Copyright Claims Officers and the Register of Copyrights concerning the substance of any active or pending proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board.

“(g) Judicial Review.—Actions of the Copyright Claims Officers and Register of Copyrights under this chapter in connection with the rendering of any determination are subject to judicial review as provided under section 1508(c) and not under chapter 7 of title 5.

§1504. Nature of proceedings

“(a) Voluntary Participation.—Participation in a Copyright Claims Board proceeding shall be on a voluntary basis in accordance with this chapter and the right of any party to instead pursue a claim, counterclaim, or defense in a district court of the United States, any other court, or any other forum, and to seek a jury trial, shall be preserved. The rights, remedies, and limitations under this section may not be waived except in accordance with this chapter.

“(b) Statute of Limitations.—
“(1) In general.—A proceeding may not be maintained before the Copyright Claims Board unless the proceeding is commenced, in accordance with section 1506(e), before the Copyright Claims Board within 3 years after the claim accrued.

“(2) Tolling.—Subject to section 1507(a), a proceeding commenced before the Copyright Claims Board shall toll the time permitted under section 507(b) for the commencement of an action on the same claim in a district court of the United States during the period in which the proceeding is pending.

“(c) Permissible claims, counterclaims, and defenses.—The Copyright Claims Board may render determinations with respect to the following claims, counterclaims, and defenses, subject to such further limitations and requirements, including with respect to particular classes of works, as may be set forth in regulations established by the Register of Copyrights:

“(1) A claim for infringement of an exclusive right in a copyrighted work provided under section 106 by the legal or beneficial owner of the exclusive right at the time of the infringement for which the claimant seeks damages, if any, within the limitations set forth in subsection (e)(1).
“(2) A claim for a declaration of noninfringement of an exclusive right in a copyrighted work provided under section 106, consistent with section 2201 of title 28.

“(3) A claim under section 512(f) for misrepresentation in connection with a notification of claimed infringement or a counter notification seeking to replace removed or disabled material, except that any remedies relating to such a claim in a proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board shall be limited to those available under this chapter.

“(4) A counterclaim that is asserted solely against the claimant in a proceeding—

“(A) pursuant to which the counterclaimant seeks damages, if any, within the limitations set forth in subsection (e)(1); and

“(B) that—

“(i) arises under section 106 or section 512(f) and out of the same transaction or occurrence that is the subject of a claim of infringement brought under paragraph (1), a claim of noninfringement brought under paragraph (2), or a claim of misrepresentation brought under paragraph (3); or
“(ii) arises under an agreement pertaining to the same transaction or occurrence that is the subject of a claim of infringement brought under paragraph (1), if the agreement could affect the relief awarded to the claimant.

“(5) A legal or equitable defense under this title or otherwise available under law, in response to a claim or counterclaim asserted under this subsection.

“(6) A single claim or multiple claims permitted under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) by one or more claimants against one or more respondents, but only if all claims asserted in any one proceeding arise out of the same allegedly infringing activity or continuous course of infringing activities and do not, in the aggregate, result in the recovery of such claim or claims for damages that exceed the limitations under subsection (e)(1).

“(d) EXCLUDED CLAIMS.—The following claims and counterclaims are not subject to determination by the Copyright Claims Board:

“(1) A claim or counterclaim that is not a permissible claim or counterclaim under subsection (e).

“(2) A claim or counterclaim that has been finally adjudicated by a court of competent jurisdic-
tion or that is pending before a court of competent
jurisdiction, unless that court has granted a stay to
permit that claim or counterclaim to proceed before
the Copyright Claims Board.

“(3) A claim or counterclaim by or against a
Federal or State governmental entity.

“(4) A claim or counterclaim asserted against a
person or entity residing outside of the United
States, except in a case in which the person or entity
initiated the proceeding before the Copyright Claims
Board and is subject to counterclaims under this
chapter.

“(e) Permissible Remedies.—

“(1) Monetary recovery.—

“(A) Actual damages, profits, and
statutory damages for infringement.—
With respect to a claim or counterclaim for in-
fringement of copyright, and subject to the limi-
tation on total monetary recovery under sub-
paragraph (D), the Copyright Claims Board
may award either of the following:

“(i) Actual damages and profits deter-
mined in accordance with section 504(b),
with that award taking into consideration,
in appropriate cases, whether the infring-
the infringing activity under paragraph (2).

“(ii) Statutory damages, which shall be determined in accordance with section 504(c), subject to the following conditions:

“(I) With respect to works timely registered under section 412, so that the works are eligible for an award of statutory damages in accordance with that section, the statutory damages may not exceed $15,000 for each work infringed.

“(II) With respect to works not timely registered under section 412, but eligible for an award of statutory damages under this section, statutory damages may not exceed $7,500 per work infringed, or a total of $15,000 in any one proceeding.

“(III) The Copyright Claims Board may not make any finding that, or consider whether, the infringement was committed willfully in
making an award of statutory damages.

“(IV) The Copyright Claims Board may consider, as an additional factor in awarding statutory damages, whether the infringer has agreed to cease or mitigate the infringing activity under paragraph (2).

“(B) Election of damages.—With respect to a claim or counterclaim of infringement, at any time before final determination is rendered, and notwithstanding the schedule established by the Copyright Claims Board under section 1506(k), the claimant or counterclaimant shall elect—

“(i) to recover actual damages and profits or statutory damages under subparagraph (A); or

“(ii) not to recover damages.

“(C) DAMAGES FOR OTHER CLAIMS.—Damages for claims and counterclaims other than infringement claims, such as those brought under section 512(f), shall be subject to the limitation under subparagraph (D).
“(D) LIMITATION ON TOTAL MONETARY RECOVERY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a party that pursues any one or more claims or counterclaims in any single proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board may not seek or recover in that proceeding a total monetary recovery that exceeds the sum of $30,000, exclusive of any attorneys’ fees and costs that may be awarded under section 1506(y)(2).

“(2) AGREEMENT TO CEASE CERTAIN ACTIVITY.—In a determination of the Copyright Claims Board, the Board shall include a requirement to cease conduct if, in the proceeding relating to the determination—

“(A) a party agrees—

“(i) to cease activity that is found to be infringing, including removing or disabling access to, or destroying, infringing materials; or

“(ii) to cease sending a takedown notice or counter notice under section 512 to the other party regarding the conduct at issue before the Board if that notice or counter notice was found to be a knowing
material misrepresentation under section
512(f); and
“(B) the agreement described in subparagraph (A) is reflected in the record for the proceeding.
“(3) ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND COSTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except in the case of bad faith conduct as provided in section 1506(y)(2), the parties to proceedings before the Copyright Claims Board shall bear their own attorneys’ fees and costs.
“(f) JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY.—Parties to a proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board may be found jointly and severally liable if all such parties and relevant claims or counterclaims arise from the same activity or activities.
“(g) PERMISSIBLE NUMBER OF CASES.—The Register of Copyrights may establish regulations relating to the permitted number of proceedings each year by the same claimant under this chapter, in the interests of justice and the administration of the Copyright Claims Board.
§ 1505. Registration requirement
“(a) APPLICATION OR CERTIFICATE.—A claim or counterclaim alleging infringement of an exclusive right
in a copyrighted work may not be asserted before the Copyright Claims Board unless—

"(1) the legal or beneficial owner of the copyright has first delivered a completed application, a deposit, and the required fee for registration of the copyright to the Copyright Office; and

"(2) a registration certificate has either been issued or has not been refused.

"(b) Certificate of Registration.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a claimant or counterclaimant in a proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board shall be eligible to recover actual damages and profits or statutory damages under this chapter for infringement of a work if the requirements of subsection (a) have been met, except that—

"(1) the Copyright Claims Board may not render a determination in the proceeding until—

"(A) a registration certificate with respect to the work has been issued by the Copyright Office, submitted to the Copyright Claims Board, and made available to the other parties to the proceeding; and

"(B) the other parties to the proceeding have been provided an opportunity to address the registration certificate;
“(2) if the proceeding may not proceed further because a registration certificate for the work is pending, the proceeding shall be held in abeyance pending submission of the certificate to the Copyright Claims Board, except that, if the proceeding is held in abeyance for more than 1 year, the Copyright Claims Board may, upon providing written notice to the parties to the proceeding, and 30 days to the parties to respond to the notice, dismiss the proceeding without prejudice; and

“(3) if the Copyright Claims Board receives notice that registration with respect to the work has been refused, the proceeding shall be dismissed without prejudice.

“(c) PRESUMPTION.—In a case in which a registration certificate shows that registration with respect to a work was issued not later than 5 years after the date of the first publication of the work, the presumption under section 410(c) shall apply in a proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board, in addition to relevant principles of law under this title.

“(d) REGULATIONS.—In order to ensure that actions before the Copyright Claims Board proceed in a timely manner, the Register of Copyrights shall establish regulations allowing the Copyright Office to make a decision,
on an expedited basis, to issue or deny copyright registration for an unregistered work that is at issue before the Board.

§1506. Conduct of proceedings

“(a) In General.—

“(1) Applicable Law.—Proceedings of the Copyright Claims Board shall be conducted in accordance with this chapter and regulations established by the Register of Copyrights under this chapter, in addition to relevant principles of law under this title.

“(2) Conflicting Precedent.—If it appears that there may be conflicting judicial precedent on an issue of substantive copyright law that cannot be reconciled, the Copyright Claims Board shall follow the law of the Federal jurisdiction in which the action could have been brought if filed in a district court of the United States, or, if the action could have been brought in more than one such jurisdiction, the jurisdiction that the Copyright Claims Board determines has the most significant ties to the parties and conduct at issue.

“(b) Record.—The Copyright Claims Board shall maintain records documenting the proceedings before the Board.
“(c) CENTRALIZED PROCESS.—Proceedings before the Copyright Claims Board shall—

“(1) be conducted at the offices of the Copyright Claims Board without the requirement of in-person appearances by parties or others; and

“(2) take place by means of written submissions, hearings, and conferences carried out through internet-based applications and other telecommunications facilities, except that, in cases in which physical or other nontestimonial evidence material to a proceeding cannot be furnished to the Copyright Claims Board through available telecommunications facilities, the Copyright Claims Board may make alternative arrangements for the submission of such evidence that do not prejudice any other party to the proceeding.

“(d) REPRESENTATION.—A party to a proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board may be, but is not required to be, represented by—

“(1) an attorney; or

“(2) a law student who is qualified under applicable law governing representation by law students of parties in legal proceedings and who provides such representation on a pro bono basis.
“(e) Commencement of Proceeding.—In order to commence a proceeding under this chapter, a claimant shall, subject to such additional requirements as may be prescribed in regulations established by the Register of Copyrights, file a claim with the Copyright Claims Board, that—

“(1) includes a statement of material facts in support of the claim;

“(2) is certified under subsection (y)(1); and

“(3) is accompanied by a filing fee in such amount as may be prescribed in regulations established by the Register of Copyrights.

“(f) Review of Claims and Counterclaims.—

“(1) Claims.—Upon the filing of a claim under subsection (e), the claim shall be reviewed by a Copyright Claims Attorney to ensure that the claim complies with this chapter and applicable regulations, subject to the following:

“(A) If the claim is found to comply, the claimant shall be notified regarding that compliance and instructed to proceed with service of the claim under subsection (g).

“(B) If the claim is found not to comply, the claimant shall be notified that the claim is deficient and be permitted to file an amended
claim not later than 30 days after the date on which the claimant receives the notice, without the requirement of an additional filing fee. If the claimant files a compliant claim within that 30-day period, the claimant shall be so notified and be instructed to proceed with service of the claim. If the claim is refiled within that 30-day period and still fails to comply, the claimant shall again be notified that the claim is deficient and shall be provided a second opportunity to amend the claim within 30 days after the date of that second notice, without the requirement of an additional filing fee. If the claim is refiled again within that second 30-day period and is compliant, the claimant shall be so notified and shall be instructed to proceed with service of the claim, but if the claim still fails to comply, upon confirmation of such non-compliance by a Copyright Claims Officer, the proceeding shall be dismissed without prejudice. The Copyright Claims Board shall also dismiss without prejudice any proceeding in which a compliant claim is not filed within the applicable 30-day period.
“(C)(i) Subject to clause (ii), for purposes of this paragraph, a claim against an online service provider for infringement by reason of the storage of or referral or linking to infringing material that may be subject to the limitations on liability set forth in subsection (b), (c), or (d) of section 512 shall be considered non-compliant unless the claimant affirms in the statement required under subsection (e)(1) of this section that the claimant has previously notified the service provider of the claimed infringement in accordance with subsection (b)(2)(E), (e)(3), or (d)(3) of section 512, as applicable, and the service provider failed to remove or disable access to the material expeditiously upon the provision of such notice.

“(ii) If a claim is found to be noncompliant under clause (i), the Copyright Claims Board shall provide the claimant with information concerning the service of such a notice under the applicable provision of section 512.

“(2) COUNTERCLAIMS.—Upon the filing and service of a counterclaim, the counterclaim shall be reviewed by a Copyright Claims Attorney to ensure that the counterclaim complies with the provisions of
this chapter and applicable regulations. If the counterclaim is found not to comply, the counterclaimant and the other parties to the proceeding shall be notified that the counterclaim is deficient, and the counterclaimant shall be permitted to file and serve an amended counterclaim within 30 days after the date of such notice. If the counterclaimant files and serves a compliant counterclaim within that 30-day period, the counterclaimant and such other parties shall be so notified. If the counterclaim is refiled and served within that 30-day period but still fails to comply, the counterclaimant and such other parties shall again be notified that the counterclaim is deficient, and the counterclaimant shall be provided a second opportunity to amend the counterclaim within 30 days after the date of the second notice. If the counterclaim is refiled and served again within that second 30-day period and is compliant, the counterclaimant and such other parties shall be so notified, but if the counterclaim still fails to comply, upon confirmation of such noncompliance by a Copyright Claims Officer, the counterclaim, but not the proceeding, shall be dismissed without prejudice.

“(3) DISMISSAL FOR UNSUITABILITY.—The Copyright Claims Board shall dismiss a claim or
counterclaim without prejudice if, upon reviewing
the claim or counterclaim, or at any other time in
the proceeding, the Copyright Claims Board con-
cludes that the claim or counterclaim is unsuitable
for determination by the Copyright Claims Board,
including on account of any of the following:

“(A) The failure to join a necessary party.

“(B) The lack of an essential witness, evi-
dence, or expert testimony.

“(C) The determination of a relevant issue
of law or fact that could exceed either the num-
ber of proceedings the Copyright Claims Board
could reasonably administer or the subject mat-
ter competence of the Copyright Claims Board.

“(g) SERVICE OF NOTICE AND CLAIMS.—In order to
proceed with a claim against a respondent, a claimant
shall, within 90 days after receiving notification under
subsection (f) to proceed with service, file with the Copy-
right Claims Board proof of service on the respondent. In
order to effectuate service on a respondent, the claimant
shall cause notice of the proceeding and a copy of the
claim to be served on the respondent, either by personal
service or pursuant to a waiver of personal service, as pre-
scribed in regulations established by the Register of Copy-
rights. Such regulations shall include the following re-
quirements:

“(1) The notice of the proceeding shall adhere
to a prescribed form and shall set forth the nature
of the Copyright Claims Board and proceeding, the
right of the respondent to opt out, and the con-
sequences of opting out and not opting out, includ-
ing a prominent statement that, by not opting out
within 60 days after receiving the notice, the re-
spondent—

“(A) loses the opportunity to have the dis-
pute decided by a court created under article
III of the Constitution of the United States;
and

“(B) waives the right to a jury trial re-
garding the dispute.

“(2) The copy of the claim served on the re-
spondent shall be the same as the claim that was
filed with the Copyright Claims Board.

“(3) Personal service of a notice and claim may
be effected by an individual who is not a party to
the proceeding and is older than 18 years of age.

“(4) An individual, other than a minor or in-
competent individual, may be served by—
“(A) complying with State law for serving
a summons in an action brought in courts of
general jurisdiction in the State where service is
made;

“(B) delivering a copy of the notice and
claim to the individual personally;

“(C) leaving a copy of the notice and claim
at the individual’s dwelling or usual place of
abode with someone of suitable age and discre-
tion who resides there; or

“(D) delivering a copy of the notice and
claim to an agent designated by the respondent
to receive service of process or, if not so des-
ignated, an agent authorized by appointment or
by law to receive service of process.

“(5)(A) A corporation, partnership, or unincor-
porated association that is subject to suit in courts
of general jurisdiction under a common name shall
be served by delivering a copy of the notice and
claim to its service agent. If such service agent has
not been designated, service shall be accomplished—

“(i) by complying with State law for serv-
ing a summons in an action brought in courts
of general jurisdiction in the State where serv-
ice is made; or
“(ii) by delivering a copy of the notice and claim to an officer, a managing or general agent, or any other agent authorized by appointment or by law to receive service of process in an action brought in courts of general jurisdiction in the State where service is made and, if the agent is one authorized by statute and the statute so requires, by also mailing a copy of the notice and claim to the respondent.

“(B) A corporation, partnership or unincorporated association that is subject to suit in courts of general jurisdiction under a common name may elect to designate a service agent to receive notice of a claim against it before the Copyright Claims Board by complying with requirements that the Register of Copyrights shall establish by regulation. The Register of Copyrights shall maintain a current directory of service agents that is available to the public for inspection, including through the internet, and may require such corporations, partnerships, and unincorporated associations designating such service agents to pay a fee to cover the costs of maintaining the directory.

“(6) In order to request a waiver of personal service, the claimant may notify a respondent, by
first class mail or by other reasonable means, that
a proceeding has been commenced, such notice to be
made in accordance with regulations established by
the Register of Copyrights, subject to the following:

“(A) Any such request shall be in writing,
shall be addressed to the respondent, and shall
be accompanied by a prescribed notice of the
proceeding, a copy of the claim as filed with the
Copyright Claims Board, a prescribed form for
waiver of personal service, and a prepaid or
other means of returning the form without cost.

“(B) The request shall state the date on
which the request is sent, and shall provide the
respondent a period of 30 days, beginning on
the date on which the request is sent, to return
the waiver form signed by the respondent. The
signed waiver form shall, for purposes of this
subsection, constitute acceptance and proof of
service as of the date on which the waiver is
signed.

“(7)(A) A respondent’s waiver of personal serv-
ice shall not constitute a waiver of the respondent’s
right to opt out of the proceeding.

“(B) A respondent who timely waives personal
service under paragraph (6) and does not opt out of
the proceeding shall be permitted a period of 30 days, in addition to the period otherwise permitted under the applicable procedures of the Copyright Claims Board, to submit a substantive response to the claim, including any defenses and counterclaims.

“(8) A minor or an incompetent individual may only be served by complying with State law for serving a summons or like process on such an individual in an action brought in the courts of general jurisdiction of the State where service is made.

“(9) Service of a claim and waiver of personal service may only be effected within the United States.

“(h) Notification by Copyright Claims Board.—The Register of Copyrights shall establish regulations providing for a written notification to be sent by, or on behalf of, the Copyright Claims Board to notify the respondent of a pending proceeding against the respondent, as set forth in those regulations, which shall—

“(1) include information concerning the respondent’s right to opt out of the proceeding, the consequences of opting out and not opting out, and a prominent statement that, by not opting out within 60 days after the date of service under subsection (g), the respondent loses the opportunity to have the
dispute decided by a court created under article III of the Constitution of the United States and waives the right to a jury trial regarding the dispute; and

“(2) be in addition to, and separate and apart from, the notice requirements under subsection (g).

“(i) Opt-Out Procedure.—Upon being properly served with a notice and claim, a respondent who chooses to opt out of the proceeding shall have a period of 60 days, beginning on the date of service, in which to provide written notice of such choice to the Copyright Claims Board, in accordance with regulations established by the Register of Copyrights. If proof of service has been filed by the claimant and the respondent does not submit an opt-out notice to the Copyright Claims Board within that 60-day period, the proceeding shall be deemed an active proceeding and the respondent shall be bound by the determination in the proceeding to the extent provided under section 1507(a). If the respondent opts out of the proceeding during that 60-day period, the proceeding shall be dismissed without prejudice, except that, in exceptional circumstances and upon written notice to the claimant, the Copyright Claims Board may extend that 60-day period in the interests of justice.

“(j) Service of Other Documents.—Documents submitted or relied upon in a proceeding, other than the
notice and claim, shall be served in accordance with regulations established by the Register of Copyrights.

“(k) SCHEDULING.—Upon confirmation that a proceeding has become an active proceeding, the Copyright Claims Board shall issue a schedule for the future conduct of the proceeding. The schedule shall not specify a time that a claimant or counterclaimant is required make an election of damages that is inconsistent with section 1504(e). A schedule issued by the Copyright Claims Board may be amended by the Copyright Claims Board in the interests of justice.

“(l) CONFERENCES.—One or more Copyright Claims Officers may hold a conference to address case management or discovery issues in a proceeding, which shall be noted upon the record of the proceeding and may be recorded or transcribed.

“(m) PARTY SUBMISSIONS.—A proceeding of the Copyright Claims Board may not include any formal motion practice, except that, subject to applicable regulations and procedures of the Copyright Claims Board—

“(1) the parties to the proceeding may make requests to the Copyright Claims Board to address case management and discovery matters, and submit responses thereto; and
“(2) the Copyright Claims Board may request or permit parties to make submissions addressing relevant questions of fact or law, or other matters, including matters raised sua sponte by the Copyright Claims Officers, and offer responses thereto.

“(n) DISCOVERY.—Discovery in a proceeding shall be limited to the production of relevant information and documents, written interrogatories, and written requests for admission, as provided in regulations established by the Register of Copyrights, except that—

“(1) upon the request of a party, and for good cause shown, the Copyright Claims Board may approve additional relevant discovery, on a limited basis, in particular matters, and may request specific information and documents from participants in the proceeding and voluntary submissions from non-participants, consistent with the interests of justice;

“(2) upon the request of a party, and for good cause shown, the Copyright Claims Board may issue a protective order to limit the disclosure of documents or testimony that contain confidential information; and

“(3) after providing notice and an opportunity to respond, and upon good cause shown, the Copyright Claims Board may apply an adverse inference
with respect to disputed facts against a party who has failed to timely provide discovery materials in response to a proper request for materials that could be relevant to such facts.

“(o) EVIDENCE.—The Copyright Claims Board may consider the following types of evidence in a proceeding, and such evidence may be admitted without application of formal rules of evidence:

“(1) Documentary and other nontestimonial evidence that is relevant to the claims, counterclaims, or defenses in the proceeding.

“(2) Testimonial evidence, submitted under penalty of perjury in written form or in accordance with subsection (p), limited to statements of the parties and nonexpert witnesses, that is relevant to the claims, counterclaims, and defenses in a proceeding, except that, in exceptional cases, expert witness testimony or other types of testimony may be permitted by the Copyright Claims Board for good cause shown.

“(p) HEARINGS.—The Copyright Claims Board may conduct a hearing to receive oral presentations on issues of fact or law from parties and witnesses to a proceeding, including oral testimony, subject to the following:
“(1) Any such hearing shall be attended by not fewer than two of the Copyright Claims Officers.

“(2) The hearing shall be noted upon the record of the proceeding and, subject to paragraph (3), may be recorded or transcribed as deemed necessary by the Copyright Claims Board.

“(3) A recording or transcript of the hearing shall be made available to any Copyright Claims Officer who is not in attendance.

“(q) VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL.—

“(1) By claimant.—Upon the written request of a claimant that is received before a respondent files a response to the claim in a proceeding, the Copyright Claims Board shall dismiss the proceeding, or a claim or respondent, as requested, without prejudice.

“(2) By counterclaimant.—Upon written request of a counterclaimant that is received before a claimant files a response to the counterclaim, the Copyright Claims Board shall dismiss the counterclaim, such dismissal to be without prejudice.

“(3) Class actions.—Any party in an active proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board who receives notice of a pending or putative class action, arising out of the same transaction or occurrence, in
which that party is a class member may request in
writing dismissal of the proceeding before the Board.
Upon notice to all claimants and counterclaimants,
the Copyright Claims Board shall dismiss the pro-
ceeding without prejudice.

(“r) Settlement.—

“(1) In general.—At any time in an active
proceeding, some or all of the parties may—

“(A) jointly request a conference with a
Copyright Claims Officer for the purpose of fa-
cilitating settlement discussions; or

“(B) submit to the Copyright Claims
Board an agreement providing for settlement
and dismissal of some or all of the claims and
counterclaims in the proceeding.

“(2) Additional request.—A submission
under paragraph (1)(B) may include a request that
the Copyright Claims Board adopt some or all of the
terms of the parties’ settlement in a final determina-
tion in the proceeding.

“(s) Factual findings.—Subject to subsection
(n)(3), the Copyright Claims Board shall make factual
findings based upon a preponderance of the evidence.

“(t) Determinations.—
“(1) Nature and Contents.—A determination rendered by the Copyright Claims Board in a proceeding shall—

“(A) be reached by a majority of the Copyright Claims Board;

“(B) be in writing, and include an explanation of the factual and legal basis of the determination;

“(C) set forth any terms by which a respondent or counterclaim respondent has agreed to cease infringing activity under section 1504(e)(2);

“(D) to the extent requested under subsection (r)(2), set forth the terms of any settlement agreed to under subsection (r)(1); and

“(E) include a clear statement of all damages and other relief awarded, including under subparagraphs (C) and (D).

“(2) Dissent.—A Copyright Claims Officer who dissents from a decision contained in a determination under paragraph (1) may append a statement setting forth the grounds for that dissent.

“(3) Publication.—Each final determination of the Copyright Claims Board shall be made available on a publicly accessible website. The Register
shall establish regulations with respect to the publication of other records and information relating to such determinations, including the redaction of records to protect confidential information that is the subject of a protective order under subsection (n)(2).

“(4) FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.—All information relating to proceedings of the Copyright Claims Board under this title is exempt from disclosure to the public under section 552(b)(3) of title 5, except for determinations, records, and information published under paragraph (3).

“(u) RESPONDENT’S DEFAULT.—If a proceeding has been deemed an active proceeding but the respondent has failed to appear or has ceased participating in the proceeding, as demonstrated by the respondent’s failure, without justifiable cause, to meet one or more deadlines or requirements set forth in the schedule adopted by the Copyright Claims Board under subsection (k), the Copyright Claims Board may enter a default determination, including the dismissal of any counterclaim asserted by the respondent, as follows and in accordance with such other requirements as the Register of Copyrights may establish by regulation:
“(1) The Copyright Claims Board shall require the claimant to submit relevant evidence and other information in support of the claimant’s claim and any asserted damages and, upon review of such evidence and any other requested submissions from the claimant, shall determine whether the materials so submitted are sufficient to support a finding in favor of the claimant under applicable law and, if so, the appropriate relief and damages, if any, to be awarded.

“(2) If the Copyright Claims Board makes an affirmative determination under paragraph (1), the Copyright Claims Board shall prepare a proposed default determination, and shall provide written notice to the respondent at all addresses, including email addresses, reflected in the records of the proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board, of the pending determination by the Copyright Claims Board and of the legal significance of such determination. Such notice shall be accompanied by the proposed default determination and shall provide that the respondent has a period of 30 days, beginning on the date of the notice, to submit any evidence or other information in opposition to the proposed default determination.
“(3) If the respondent responds to the notice provided under paragraph (2) within the 30-day period provided in such paragraph, the Copyright Claims Board shall consider respondent’s submissions and, after allowing the other parties to address such submissions, maintain, or amend its proposed determination as appropriate, and the resulting determination shall not be a default determination.

“(4) If the respondent fails to respond to the notice provided under paragraph (2), the Copyright Claims Board shall proceed to issue the default determination as a final determination. Thereafter, the respondent may only challenge such determination to the extent permitted under section 1508(c), except that, before any additional proceedings are initiated under section 1508, the Copyright Claims Board may, in the interests of justice, vacate the default determination.

“(v) CLAIMANT’S FAILURE TO PROCEED.—

“(1) FAILURE TO COMPLETE SERVICE.—If a claimant fails to complete service on a respondent within the 90-day period required under subsection (g), the Copyright Claims Board shall dismiss that respondent from the proceeding without prejudice. If a claimant fails to complete service on all respond-
ents within that 90-day period, the Copyright Claims Board shall dismiss the proceeding without prejudice.

“(2) FAILURE TO PROSECUTE.—If a claimant fails to proceed in an active proceeding, as demonstrated by the claimant’s failure, without justifiable cause, to meet one or more deadlines or requirements set forth in the schedule adopted by the Copyright Claims Board under subsection (k), the Copyright Claims Board may, upon providing written notice to the claimant and a period of 30 days, beginning on the date of the notice, to respond to the notice, and after considering any such response, issue a determination dismissing the claimants’ claims, which shall include an award of attorneys’ fees and costs, if appropriate, under subsection (y)(2). Thereafter, the claimant may only challenge such determination to the extent permitted under section 1508(c), except that, before any additional proceedings are initiated under section 1508, the Copyright Claims Board may, in the interests of justice, vacate the determination of dismissal.

“(w) REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION.—A party may, within 30 days after the date on which the Copyright Claims Board issues a final determination in a proceeding
under this chapter, submit a written request for reconsideration of, or an amendment to, such determination if the party identifies a clear error of law or fact material to the outcome, or a technical mistake. After providing the other parties an opportunity to address such request, the Copyright Claims Board shall either deny the request or issue an amended final determination.

“(x) Review by Register.—If the Copyright Claims Board denies a party a request for reconsideration of a final determination under subsection (w), that party may, within 30 days after the date of such denial, request review of the final determination by the Register of Copyrights in accordance with regulations established by the Register. Such request shall be accompanied by a reasonable filing fee, as provided in such regulations. The review by the Register shall be limited to consideration of whether the Copyright Claims Board abused its discretion in denying reconsideration of the determination. After providing the other parties an opportunity to address the request, the Register shall either deny the request for review, or remand the proceeding to the Copyright Claims Board for reconsideration of issues specified in the remand and for issuance of an amended final determination. Such amended final determination shall not be subject to further consideration or review, other than under section 1508(c).
“(y) CONDUCT OF PARTIES AND ATTORNEYS.—

“(1) CERTIFICATION.—The Register of Copyrights shall establish regulations requiring certification of the accuracy and truthfulness of statements made by participants in proceedings before the Copyright Claims Board.

“(2) BAD FAITH CONDUCT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any proceeding in which a determination is rendered and it is established that a party pursued a claim, counterclaim, or defense for a harassing or other improper purpose, or without a reasonable basis in law or fact, then, unless inconsistent with the interests of justice, the Copyright Claims Board shall in such determination award reasonable costs and attorneys’ fees to any adversely affected party of in an amount of not more than $5,000, except that—

“(A) if an adversely affected party appeared pro se in the proceeding, the award to that party shall be for costs only, in an amount of not more than $2,500; and

“(B) in extraordinary circumstances, such as where a party has demonstrated a pattern or practice of bad faith conduct as described in this paragraph, the Copyright Claims Board
may, in the interests of justice, award costs and attorneys’ fees in excess of the limitations under this paragraph.

“(3) ADDITIONAL PENALTY.—If the Board finds that on more than one occasion within a 12-month period a party pursued a claim, counterclaim, or defense before the Copyright Claims Board for a harassing or other improper purpose, or without a reasonable basis in law or fact, that party shall be barred from initiating a claim before the Copyright Claims Board under this chapter for a period of 12 months beginning on the date on which the Board makes such a finding. Any proceeding commenced by that party that is still pending before the Board when such a finding is made shall be dismissed without prejudice, except that if a proceeding has been deemed active under subsection (i), the proceeding shall be dismissed under this paragraph only if the respondent provides written consent thereto.

“(z) REGULATIONS FOR SMALLER CLAIMS.—The Register of Copyrights shall establish regulations to provide for the consideration and determination, by at least one Copyright Claims Officer, of any claim under this chapter in which total damages sought do not exceed $5,000 (exclusive of attorneys’ fees and costs) that are
otherwise consistent with this chapter. A determination issued under this subsection shall have the same effect as a determination issued by the entire Copyright Claims Board.

§ 1507. Effect of proceeding

(a) DETERMINATION.—Subject to the reconsideration and review processes provided under subsections (w) and (x) of section 1506 and section 1508(c), the issuance of a final determination by the Copyright Claims Board in a proceeding, including a default determination or determination based on a failure to prosecute, shall, solely with respect to the parties to such determination, preclude relitigation before any court or tribunal, or before the Copyright Claims Board, of the claims and counterclaims asserted and finally determined by the Board, and may be relied upon for such purpose in a future action or proceeding arising from the same specific activity or activities, subject to the following:

(1) A determination of the Copyright Claims Board shall not preclude litigation or relitigation as between the same or different parties before any court or tribunal, or the Copyright Claims Board, of the same or similar issues of fact or law in connection with claims or counterclaims not asserted or not finally determined by the Copyright Claims Board.
“(2) A determination of ownership of a copyrighted work for purposes of resolving a matter before the Copyright Claims Board may not be relied upon, and shall not have any preclusive effect, in any other action or proceeding before any court or tribunal, including the Copyright Claims Board.

“(3) Except to the extent permitted under this subsection and section 1508, any determination of the Copyright Claims Board may not be cited or relied upon as legal precedent in any other action or proceeding before any court or tribunal, including the Copyright Claims Board.

“(b) CLASS ACTIONS NOT AFFECTED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board shall not have any effect on a class action proceeding in a district court of the United States, and section 1509(a) shall not apply to a class action proceeding in a district court of the United States.

“(2) NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION.—Any party to an active proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board who receives notice of a pending class action, arising out of the same transaction or occurrence as the proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board, in which the party is a class member shall either—
“(A) opt out of the class action, in accordance with regulations established by the Register of Copyrights; or

“(B) seek dismissal under section 1506(q)(3) of the proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board.

“(c) Other Materials in Proceeding.—Except as permitted under this section and section 1508, a submission or statement of a party or witness made in connection with a proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board, including a proceeding that is dismissed, may not be cited or relied upon in, or serve as the basis of, any action or proceeding concerning rights or limitations on rights under this title before any court or tribunal, including the Copyright Claims Board.

“(d) Applicability of Section 512(g).—A claim or counterclaim before the Copyright Claims Board that is brought under subsection (c)(1) or (c)(4) of section 1504, or brought under subsection (c)(6) of section 1504 and that relates to a claim under subsection (c)(1) or (c)(4) of such section, qualifies as an action seeking an order to restrain a subscriber from engaging in infringing activity under section 512(g)(2)(C) if—

“(1) notice of the commencement of the Copyright Claims Board proceeding is provided by the
claimant to the service provider’s designated agent before the service provider replaces the material following receipt of a counter notification under section 512(g); and

“(2) the claim brought alleges infringement of the material identified in the notification of claimed infringement under section 512(c)(1)(C).

“(e) Failure To Assert Counterclaim.—The failure or inability to assert a counterclaim in a proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board shall not preclude the assertion of that counterclaim in a subsequent court action or proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board.

“(f) Opt-Out or Dismissal of Party.—If a party has timely opted out of a proceeding under section 1506(i) or is dismissed from a proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board issues a final determination in the proceeding, the determination shall not be binding upon and shall have no preclusive effect with respect to that party.

§1508. Review and confirmation by district court

“(a) In General.—In any proceeding in which a party has failed to pay damages, or has failed otherwise to comply with the relief, awarded in a final determination of the Copyright Claims Board, including a default determination or a determination based on a failure to prosecute, the aggrieved party may, not later than 1 year after
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the date on which the final determination is issued, any reconsideration by the Copyright Claims Board or review by the Register of Copyrights is resolved, or an amended final determination is issued, whichever occurs last, apply to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or any other appropriate district court of the United States for an order confirming the relief awarded in the final determination and reducing such award to judgment. The court shall grant such order and direct entry of judgment unless the determination is or has been vacated, modified, or corrected under subsection (c). If the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or other district court of the United States, as the case may be, issues an order confirming the relief awarded by the Copyright Claims Board, the court shall impose on the party who failed to pay damages or otherwise comply with the relief, the reasonable expenses required to secure such order, including attorneys’ fees, that were incurred by the aggrieved party.

“(b) FILING PROCEDURES.—

“(1) APPLICATION TO CONFIRM DETERMINATION.—Notice of the application under subsection (a) for confirmation of a determination of the Copyright Claims Board and entry of judgment shall be provided to all parties to the proceeding before the

VerDate Sep 11 2014 22:01 Oct 23, 2019 Jkt 099200 PO 00000 Frm 00054 Fmt 6652 Sfmt 6201 E:\BILLS\H2426.PCS H2426kjohnson on DSK79L0C42 with BILLS
Copyright Claims Board that resulted in the determination, in accordance with the procedures applicable to service of a motion in the district court of the United States where the application is made.

“(2) CONTENTS OF APPLICATION.—The application shall include the following:

“(A) A certified copy of the final or amended final determination of the Copyright Claims Board, as reflected in the records of the Copyright Claims Board, following any process of reconsideration or review by the Register of Copyrights, to be confirmed and rendered to judgment.

“(B) A declaration by the applicant, under penalty of perjury—

“(i) that the copy is a true and correct copy of such determination;

“(ii) stating the date it was issued;

“(iii) stating the basis for the challenge under subsection (c)(1); and

“(iv) stating whether the applicant is aware of any other proceedings before the court concerning the same determination of the Copyright Claims Board.

“(c) CHALLENGES TO THE DETERMINATION.—
“(1) Bases for Challenge.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which Copyright Claims Board issues a final or amended final determination in a proceeding, or not later than 90 days after the date on which the Register of Copyrights completes any process of reconsideration or review of the determination, whichever occurs later, a party may seek a court order vacating, modifying, or correcting the determination of the Copyright Claims Board in the following cases:

“(A) If the determination was issued as a result of fraud, corruption, misrepresentation, or other misconduct.

“(B) If the Copyright Claims Board exceeded its authority or failed to render a final determination concerning the subject matter at issue.

“(C) In the case of a default determination or determination based on a failure to prosecute, if it is established that the default or failure was due to excusable neglect.

“(2) Procedure to Challenge.—

“(A) Notice of Application.—Notice of the application to challenge a determination of the Copyright Claims Board shall be provided
to all parties to the proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board, in accordance with the procedures applicable to service of a motion in the court where the application is made.

“(B) STAYING OF PROCEEDINGS.—For purposes of an application under this subsection, any judge who is authorized to issue an order to stay the proceedings in an any other action brought in the same court may issue an order, to be served with the notice of application, staying proceedings to enforce the award while the challenge is pending.

§ 1509. Relationship to other district court actions

“(a) STAY OF DISTRICT COURT PROCEEDINGS.—Subject to section 1507(b), a district court of the United States shall issue a stay of proceedings or such other relief as the court determines appropriate with respect to any claim brought before the court that is already the subject of a pending or active proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board.

“(b) ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCESS.—A proceeding before the Copyright Claims Board under this chapter shall qualify as an alternative dispute resolution process under section 651 of title 28 for pur-
poses of referral of eligible cases by district courts of the
United States upon the consent of the parties.

§1510. Implementation by Copyright Office

"(a) REGULATIONS.—

"(1) IMPLEMENTATION GENERALLY.—The Register of Copyrights shall establish regulations to carry out this chapter. Such regulations shall include the fees prescribed under subsections (e) and (x) of section 1506. The authority to issue such fees shall not limit the authority of the Register of Copyrights to establish fees for services under section 708. All fees received by the Copyright Office in connection with the activities under this chapter shall be deposited by the Register of Copyrights and credited to the appropriations for necessary expenses of the Office in accordance with section 708(d). In establishing regulations under this subsection, the Register of Copyrights shall provide for the efficient administration of the Copyright Claims Board, and for the ability of the Copyright Claims Board to timely complete proceedings instituted under this chapter, including by implementing mechanisms to prevent harassing or improper use of the Copyright Claims Board by any party.

"(2) LIMITS ON MONETARY RELIEF.—
“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), not earlier than 3 years after the date on which Copyright Claims Board issues the first determination of the Copyright Claims Board, the Register of Copyrights may, in order to further the goals of the Copyright Claims Board, conduct a rulemaking to adjust the limits on monetary recovery or attorneys’ fees and costs that may be awarded under this chapter.

“(B) EFFECTIVE DATE OF ADJUSTMENT.—Any rule under subparagraph (A) that makes an adjustment shall take effect at the end of the 120-day period beginning on the date on which the Register of Copyrights submits the rule to Congress and only if Congress does not, during that 120-day period, enact a law that provides in substance that Congress does not approve the rule.

“(b) NECESSARY FACILITIES.—Subject to applicable law, the Register of Copyrights may retain outside vendors to establish internet-based, teleconferencing, and other facilities required to operate the Copyright Claims Board.

“(c) FEES.—Any filing fees, including the fee to commence a proceeding under section 1506(e), shall be prescribed in regulations established by the Register of Copy-
rights. The sum total of such filing fees shall be in an amount of at least $100, may not exceed the cost of filing an action in a district court of the United States, and shall be fixed in amounts that further the goals of the Copyright Claims Board.

“§ 1511. Funding

“There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to pay the costs incurred by the Copyright Office under this chapter that are not covered by fees collected for services rendered under this chapter, including the costs of establishing and maintaining the Copyright Claims Board and its facilities.”.

(b) Clerical Amendment.—The table of chapters for title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to chapter 14 the following:

“15. Copyright Small Claims ........................................................ 1501”.

SEC. 3. IMPLEMENTATION.

Not later 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Copyright Claims Board established under section 1502 of title 17, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act, shall begin operations.

SEC. 4. STUDY.

Not later than 3 years after the date on which Copyright Claims Board issues the first determination of the Copyright Claims Board under chapter 15 of title 17, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act,
the Register of Copyrights shall conduct, and report to
Congress on, a study that addresses the following:

(1) The use and efficacy of the Copyright
Claims Board in resolving copyright claims, including
the number of proceedings the Copyright Claims
Board could reasonably administer.

(2) Whether adjustments to the authority of the
Copyright Claims Board are necessary or advisable,
including with respect to—

(A) eligible claims, such as claims under
section 1202 of title 17, United States Code;
and

(B) works and applicable damages limita-

tions.

(3) Whether greater allowance should be made
to permit awards of attorneys’ fees and costs to pre-
vailing parties, including potential limitations on
such awards.

(4) Potential mechanisms to assist copyright
owners with small claims in ascertaining the identity
and location of unknown online infringers.

(5) Whether the Copyright Claims Board
should be expanded to offer mediation or other non-
binding alternative dispute resolution services to in-
terested parties.
(6) Such other matters as the Register of Copyrights believes may be pertinent concerning the Copyright Claims Board.

SEC. 5. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, an amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provision or the amendment to any other person or circumstance, shall not be affected.
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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

It appears beyond dispute that under the current federal system small copyright claimants face formidable challenges in seeking to enforce the exclusive rights to which they are entitled. The Copyright Office therefore recommends that Congress consider the creation of an alternative forum that will enable copyright owners to pursue small infringement matters and related claims arising under the Copyright Act.

In light of the state court tradition of referring to claims of modest economic value as “small claims,” many have adopted that term to reference the nature of the claims that are the focus of this Report, as does the Report itself. Such claims, however, are not small to the individual creators who are deprived of income or opportunity due to the misuse of their works, and the problem of addressing lower-value infringements is not a small one for our copyright system.

But how would we structure an alternative process? Concerns of pragmatism and efficiency are core considerations, but they are not the only ones, and they must be viewed in the larger context of federal powers. Our Constitution protects both the role of the federal judiciary and the rights of those who participate in adjudicatory proceedings. These principles are enshrined in Article III and the Fifth and Seventh Amendments, and in judicial interpretations of these and other constitutional provisions. Any alternative process must fit comfortably within the constitutional parameters.

In light of the existing constitutional landscape, the challenges of the current system, and the views and insights of those who participated in this study, it appears that the most promising option to address small copyright claims would be a streamlined adjudication process in which parties would participate by consent. Perhaps not surprisingly, a number of the commenting parties viewed the Copyright Office as the logical and appropriate home for such a small claims system.

In recent years, many have emphasized the potential of voluntary solutions to certain problems of copyright enforcement.11 In this case, a voluntary approach necessarily will fall short of a full-fledged judicial process, offering the complete panoply of copyright remedies, to which small copyright claimants could turn reliably and affordably to pursue infringers. Such a process is what our legal system would provide in an ideal world. But in the real world of constitutional and institutional limitations, a voluntary system with strong incentives for participation on both sides seems more attainable, at least in the near term. Importantly, such a voluntary approach would retain a mandatory backstop; parties who declined to consent to the alternative small

11 See The Role of Voluntary Agreements in the U.S. Intellectual Property System Before the Subcomm. on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet of the H. Comm. on the Judiciary, 113th Cong. (2013) (discussing various voluntary initiatives to combat copyright infringement); Center for Copyright Information, The Copyright Alert System, http://www.copyrightinformation.org/the-copyright-alert-system/ (click on embedded video) (explaining recently implemented U.S. Copyright Alert System, a voluntary system established by content owners and internet service providers (“ISPs”) by which consumers are warned against infringing conduct through participating ISPs); see also The Department of Commerce Internet Policy Task Force, Copyright Policy, Creativity, and Innovation in the Digital Economy App. A at 102-03 (July 2013) (noting Task Force’s desire to support development of voluntary enforcement initiatives).
claims proceeding could still be summoned to federal district court by a claimant who was able to take that path.

In brief summary, the Report makes the following recommendations:

• Congress should create a centralized tribunal within the Copyright Office, which would administer proceedings through online and teleconferencing facilities without the requirement of personal appearances. The tribunal would be staffed by three adjudicators, two of whom would have significant experience in copyright law – together having represented or presided over the interests of both owners and users of copyrighted works – with the third to have a background in alternative dispute resolution.

• The tribunal would be a voluntary alternative to federal court. Its focus would be on small infringement cases valued at no more than $30,000 in damages. Copyright owners would be required to have registered their works or filed an application before bringing an action. They would be eligible to recover either actual or statutory damages up to the $30,000 cap, but statutory damages would be limited to $15,000 per work (or $7,500 for a work not registered by the normally applicable deadline for statutory damages).

• Claimants who initiated a proceeding would provide notice of the claim to responding parties, who would need to agree to the process, either through an opt-out mechanism or by affirmative written consent. Respondents would be permitted to assert all relevant defenses, including fair use, as well as limited counterclaims arising from the infringing conduct at issue. Certain DMCA-related matters relating to takedown notices, including claims of misrepresentation, could also be considered, and parties threatened with an infringement action could seek a declaration of noninfringement.

• Parties would provide written submissions and hearings would be conducted through telecommunications facilities. Proceedings would be streamlined, with limited discovery and no formal motion practice. A responding party’s agreement to cease infringing activity could be considered by the tribunal and reflected in its determination. The tribunal would retain the discretion to dismiss without prejudice any claim that it did not believe could fairly be adjudicated through the small claims process.

• Determinations of the small claims tribunal would be binding only with respect to the parties and claims at issue and would have no precedential effect. They would be subject to limited administrative review for error and could be challenged in federal district court for fraud, misconduct, or other improprieties. Final determinations could be filed in federal court, if necessary, to ensure their enforceability.
II. STUDY HISTORY

Congress identified the problem of small copyright claims in 2006 as an outgrowth of its consideration of orphan works.\(^\text{12}\) As Congress considered potential solutions to the problem of orphan works, it became clear that certain claims for copyright infringement – in particular, those involving lesser amounts of damages – could not practically be pursued within the existing federal court structure. Recognizing that this concern was not limited to orphan works, in March 2006, the House of Representatives’ Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property held a separate hearing on the question of small copyright claims.\(^\text{13}\) The hearing focused on possible alternative dispute resolution systems such as a copyright “small claims court.”\(^\text{14}\) At the hearing, witnesses, including representatives of authors, musicians, illustrators, photographers, and graphic artists, testified about the challenges of the current system and the inability to address smaller infringement matters. The Copyright Office submitted a statement to the Subcommittee in which it also observed these difficulties and suggested possible avenues to be considered.\(^\text{15}\)

In October 2011, the House Judiciary Committee revisited the question of small copyright claims, requesting that the Copyright Office conduct a study to evaluate the issue.\(^\text{16}\) In a letter to the Register, then-Chairman Lamar Smith asked the Office to review “the extent to which authors and other copyright owners are effectively prevented from seeking relief from infringement due to constraints in the current system.”\(^\text{17}\) Additionally, the Office was tasked to “furnish specific recommendations, as appropriate, for changes in administrative, regulatory and statutory authority that will improve the adjudication of small copyright claims and thereby enable all copyright owners to more fully realize the promise of exclusive rights enshrined in our Constitution.”\(^\text{18}\)

\(^\text{12}\) “Orphan works” is a term used to describe the situation where the owner of a copyrighted work cannot be identified or located by someone who wishes to make use of the work in a manner that requires permission of the copyright owner. U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE, REPORT ON ORPHAN WORKS (2006), available at http://www.copyright.gov/orphan/orphan-report-full.pdf (“Orphan Works Report”).


\(^\text{14}\) 2006 Hearing at 2.


\(^\text{16}\) See Smith Letter.

\(^\text{17}\) Id.

\(^\text{18}\) Id.
In response to the October 2011 request, the Office published an initial Notice of Inquiry in the Federal Register ("First Notice of Inquiry"). There, the Office requested public comment on how copyright owners have handled small copyright claims and the obstacles they have encountered, as well as potential alternatives to the current legal system that might better accommodate such claims. The Office received fifty-five substantive responses to its notice from a broad spectrum of interested parties, including industry associations, public interest groups, technology companies, publisher representatives, legal scholars, and individual creators. Commenting parties expressed frustration with the inaccessibility of the current system, as well as concern over defendants’ rights in any alternative system.

In May 2012, the Copyright Office, along with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO"), participated in a roundtable event sponsored by the George Washington University School of Law regarding small claims. There, legal scholars and other interested parties helped to frame the issues and debated the merits of potential small claims solutions in both the copyright and patent contexts. The PTO, which is conducting its own inquiry into the area of patent small claims, has been supportive of the Copyright Office study and followed it with close interest.

The Office published a second Notice of Inquiry in August 2012 ("Second Notice of Inquiry"). This additional notice focused on potential alternatives to federal court litigation and identified a host of issues raised by commenting parties and the Office’s own research. The Second Notice of Inquiry asked for public comment on the nature of an alternative tribunal or process, qualifications of the adjudicators, discovery parameters, available relief, treatment of frivolous claims, appeal mechanisms, and constitutional concerns, among other topics. The Office received twenty-five additional comments addressed to these issues, which provided helpful guidance as the Office continued to contemplate alternatives to federal court litigation.

In November 2012, the Office held two two-day public hearings regarding the copyright small claims issue at Columbia Law School in New York City and UCLA School of Law in Los Angeles. Each hearing was divided into seven panels addressed to the following broad topics: forum, jurisdiction, and decisionmakers; subject matter, claims, and defenses; practice and procedure; litigation alternatives; relief and appeals; constitutional issues; and moving forward (which included empirical data, funding considerations, and future assessments). At each
hearing, participants representing a range of views and interests participated in lively discussions regarding potential alternative systems.\textsuperscript{24}

Finally, the Office published a third Notice of Inquiry in February 2013 ("Third Notice of Inquiry")\textsuperscript{25} which requested additional comments on some of the subjects raised in earlier comments and at the hearings. This Notice focused on whether an alternative system should be voluntary or mandatory, the types of copyrighted works that should be covered, the types of claims that would be appropriate, whether injunctive relief should be available, the role of attorneys, the enforceability of judgments, and other pertinent issues. The Office received twenty-seven further comments, again representing a wide variety of viewpoints, on these subjects.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{24} Transcripts of the hearings are available on the Office’s website at http://www.copyright.gov/docs/smallclaims/transcripts/. A list of participants in the public hearings is included in Appendix C.


\textsuperscript{26} These comments are posted on the Office’s website at http://www.copyright.gov/docs/smallclaims/comments/noi_02263013/. A list of parties who responded to the Third Notice of Inquiry is included in Appendix C.
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SUPPLEMENTAL DISCLOSURE

In response to the Court’s August 20, 2012 Order to Supplement (Dkt. 1238), Google again states that neither it nor its counsel has paid an author, journalist, commentator or blogger to report or comment on any issues in this case. Pursuant to the Court’s clarifications in the Order to Supplement, the required disclosure does not include advertising revenue, disclosed experts, or gifts to universities. Id. at 1-2. It does, however, include (a) “all commenters known by Google to have received payments as consultants, contractors, vendors, or employees”; and (b) employee-commenters at organizations who receive money from Google. Id. With that in mind, Google provides the following supplemental disclosure.

As Google indicated in its initial Response (Dkt. 1237) Google supports a wide range of individuals and organizations, many of whom regularly comment on issues relevant to technology, often taking positions adverse to Google. See, e.g., http://www.google.com/publicpolicy/transparency.html. Google has conducted a reasonable and diligent search, and has identified specific individuals and organizations in this supplemental disclosure who have commented on the issues in this case. Google did not pay for comments from any of the commenters listed in this disclosure. Nor did Google cite or rely on any of these commenters in its briefing in this case.1

I. CONSULTANTS, CONTRACTORS, VENDORS, OR EMPLOYEES.

Besides the specific individuals listed below, Google is not aware of any other consultants, contractors, vendors, or employees having commented on the litigation. Google did not pay for comments from any of these commenters.

A. William Patry

William Patry is currently a Google employee, and was a Google employee during the pendency of the lawsuit. In 1996, well over a decade before this lawsuit was filed, Mr. Patry authored an article entitled Copyright and Computer Programs: It’s All in the Definition, 14

1 Google referenced Jonathan Band’s book, Interfaces on Trial 2.0 (MIT Press 2011), in its April 3, 2012 Copyright Liability Trial Brief. As explained in Section II.B., below, Mr. Band’s book is not a “comment” on this case—it was accepted for publication before Oracle filed this lawsuit.
Cardozo Arts & Ent. L.J. 1. Oracle cited Mr. Patry’s article in its April 3, 2012 Brief Regarding Copyright Issues (Dkt. 853).

B. Timothy Bray

Tim Bray is currently a Google employee, and was a Google employee during the pendency of the lawsuit. On August 12, 2010, Mr. Bray wrote a post on his personal Twitter account in response to Oracle’s filing of the lawsuit. See Ex. A (available at https://twitter.com/timbray/status/21023407881). In that post Mr. Bray noted that he was speaking only for himself as an individual. Id.

C. Bruce Perens


D. Prof. Mark Lemley

Professor Mark Lemley serves as outside counsel to Google in unrelated cases, as does the law firm at which he is a partner: Durie Tangri.2


2 Google does not interpret the Court’s initial Order nor the Order to Supplement as requiring a response regarding Google’s counsel in the litigation.

Prof. Lemley also provided commentary via his personal Twitter account. For example, on May 7, 2012, Prof. Lemley posted a comment regarding the copyright verdict. See Ex. G (available at https://twitter.com/marklemley/statuses/199605924862771200). On May 23, 2012, Prof. Lemley also re-tweeted another Twitter post related to an interview with the foreperson for the jury in this lawsuit. See Ex. H (available at https://twitter.com/marklemley/statuses/205429756366307331)

E. James Gosling

James Gosling left Oracle America, Inc. in April 2010, before the filing of the lawsuit. Mr. Gosling was employed by Google from March 2011 to August 2011. Mr. Gosling maintains a personal blog: http://nighthacks.com/roller/jag/. Google is not aware of Mr. Gosling blogging about the lawsuit during his employment at Google. Out of an abundance of caution, because Mr. Gosling was at one time paid by Google (as a Google employee), Google notes that Mr. Gosling did blog about the lawsuit before he was employed by Google, see, e.g., Ex. I (http://nighthacks.com/roller/jag/entry/the_shit_finally_hits_the). Mr. Gosling also blogged about the lawsuit after his employment with Google ended. Specifically, during trial, Mr. Gosling wrote a blog post about the case. See Ex. J (available at http://nighthacks.com/roller/jag/entry/my_attitude_on_oracle_v). And Mr. Gosling also commented about the outcome of the trial. See Ex. K (available at http://nighthacks.com/roller/jag/entry/ovg_it_s_finally_almost). Google does not know whether and to what extent Mr. Gosling may have been receiving compensation from Oracle during the pendency of the lawsuit under the terms of any agreement between Mr. Gosling and Oracle.
F. Timothy B. Lee


Mr. Lee has also published posts via his personal Twitter account. For example, on August 7, 2012, Mr. Lee re-tweeted a post linking to his Ars Technica article “‘Name your shills,’ judge orders Oracle, Google.” See Ex. Q (available at https://twitter.com/arstechnica/status/232927734421143552). Subsequently, Mr. Lee posted that he might be on Google’s list of disclosed persons because he finished his internship for Google shortly after Oracle filed this lawsuit. See Ex. R (available at https://twitter.com/binarybits/status/232936371529060352). In a separate post on Twitter that same day Mr. Lee noted that, while he had received some money from Google while in graduate school, he had received no money from Google since becoming a full-time journalist. See Ex. S

II. EMPLOYEE-COMMENTERS AT ORGANIZATIONS WHO RECEIVE MONEY FROM GOOGLE

Besides the specific individuals listed below, Google is not aware of any other employee-commenters having commented on the litigation. Google did not pay for comments from any of these commenters.

A. Computer and Communications Industry Association

Oracle’s falsely suggests that Ed Black of the Computer and Communications Industry Association (“CCIA”) was acting under the influence of Google money when he wrote a column stating the position that APIs are not copyrightable. Oracle and its counsel had to have known that CCIA’s position on APIs pre-dated Google’s membership in CCIA—and in fact predated Google’s incorporation in 1998.

Mr. Black has publicly stated that Google did not ask him to write in support of its position, and that CCIA’s position that APIs are not copyrightable “goes back to the 1990s.” See Ex. V (“Google: No Paid Bloggers Here, Your Honor,” Aug. 17, 2012, available at http://allthingsd.com/20120817/google-no-paid-bloggers-here-your-honor/?mod=googlenews).

In fact, in December 1995, CCIA, with Mr. Black on brief, joined an amicus brief filed by the American Committee for Interoperable Systems (“ACIS”) in the Supreme Court case *Lotus v. Borland*, arguing that interface specifications are not copyrightable. Ex. W (amicus brief cover page). The counsel of record on that brief was Peter M.C. Choy, who at the time was a Deputy General Counsel for Sun Microsystems. *Id.* Mr. Choy was also chairman of the ACIS. Ex. W-1 (November 5, 1992 letter from Sun). Sun was an ACIS member and “play[ed] a leading role” in the organization. *Id.* at 1. ACIS’s Statement of Principles, as attached to the November 5, 1992 letter, stated: “The rules or specifications according to which data must be organized in order to
communicate with another program or computer, i.e., interfaces and access protocols, are not protectable expression under copyright law.” *Id.* at 4. Oracle too was an ACIS member. *Id.* at 5; *see also* Ex. V (All Things Digital article dated Aug. 17, 2012). Professor Paul Goldstein, who was also on the ACIS amicus brief, was then, as he is now, of counsel at Morrison & Foerster.3 Ex. W (amicus brief cover page).

The CCIA has commissioned studies by Mike Masnick, CEO of Floor64. *See* [http://www.floor64.com/about.php](http://www.floor64.com/about.php). Mr. Masnick has commented on the case on the TechDirt website and on his personal friendfeed.com account. *See* Ex. X (available at [http://www.techdirt.com/articles/20120523/11050519050/boom-jury-says-no-patent-infringement-google-oracle-case.shtml](http://www.techdirt.com/articles/20120523/11050519050/boom-jury-says-no-patent-infringement-google-oracle-case.shtml) and at [http://friendfeed.com/mmasnick/a3a94012/jury-google-did-not-infringe-on-oracle-patents](http://friendfeed.com/mmasnick/a3a94012/jury-google-did-not-infringe-on-oracle-patents).

**B. Jonathan Band**

Likewise, Oracle falsely suggests that Jonathan Band’s book *Interfaces on Trial 2.0* was influenced by Google money. Here, too, Oracle and its counsel had to have known that its accusations were off base.

Mr. Band has publicly stated that *Interfaces on Trial 2.0* was accepted for publication in 2009—before Oracle acquired Sun Microsystems, and before the complaint in the case at bar was filed. Ex. V (All Things Digital article dated Aug. 17, 2012). Moreover, much of the book was based on even older articles, in some cases with other Morrison & Foerster lawyers as co-authors. *Id.; see also* *Interfaces on Trial 2.0* at 50 n.100 (subsection based on 1996 article by Mr. Band and Noah Levine, then a Morrison & Foerster summer associate); *id.* at 64 n.144 (subsection based on 1999 article by Mr. Band and Taro Isshiki, then a Morrison & Foerster associate); *see also id.* at 22 n.3, 34 n.46, 37 n.50 56 n.117 & 60 n.132 (subsections based on 1995, 1996, 2000 and 2006 articles by Mr. Band).

In addition, as the title suggests and as is confirmed in the introduction, *Interfaces on Trial 2.0* is a follow-up to a previous book by Mr. Band and his co-author. The prior book, *Interfaces

3 The brief lists Professor Goldstein’s affiliation with Stanford Law School.
on Trial: Intellectual Property and Interoperability in the Global Software Industry, was published in 1995, years before the case at bar was filed. In the acknowledgements to that book, the authors thank, among others, Oracle’s lead counsel Michael Jacobs, as well as then Sun Microsystems Deputy General Counsel Peter Choy, and Professor Goldstein. See Interfaces on Trial: Intellectual Property and Interoperability in the Global Software Industry at xiii. At the time, Mr. Band was a Morrison & Foerster partner. Id. at 361.4

C. Electronic Frontier Foundation

The Electronic Frontier Foundation (“EFF”) is a non-profit organization whose mission is to “defend[] free speech, privacy, innovation, and consumer rights,” see https://www.eff.org/about, with long-standing public views on the importance of interoperability. See, e.g., https://www.eff.org/cases/blizzard-v-bnetd. Google has contributed to the EFF for years before the complaint in the case at bar was filed.

Michael Barclay, now a volunteer fellow for the Electronic Frontier Foundation, commented on the case on his blog, IP Duck. 5 See Ex. Y (available at http://ipduck.blogspot.com/2012/05/judge-alsup-rules-that-java-apis-are.html); Ex. Z (available at http://ipduck.blogspot.com/2012/05/phase-one-verdict-in-oracle-v-google.html). Mr. Barclay’s interest in the copyrightability of software interfaces, however, long predates his association with EFF, and in fact predates Google’s existence—Mr. Barclay represented Borland in Lotus v. Borland. Ex. AA (Borland’s Supreme Court merits brief).

Julie Samuels is a Staff Attorney at the EFF focusing on intellectual property issues. See https://www.eff.org/about/staff/julie-samuels. In that capacity, Ms. Samuels frequently comments on intellectual property cases of note, including this case. See Ex. BB (“No Copyrights on APIs: Judge Defends Interoperability and Innovation,” May 31, 2012, available at https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2012/05/no-copyrights-apis-judge-defends-interoperability-and-innovation); Ex. CC (“Oracle v. Google and the Dangerous Implications of Treating APIs as

---

4 His co-author worked for Fujitsu.
5 Mr. Barclay, before retiring, was a partner at Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, which represents Google in various matters, but not the case at bar.

D. Public Knowledge

Public Knowledge is a non-profit organization whose mission is to “preserv[e] the openness of the Internet and the public’s access to knowledge; promot[e] creativity through balanced copyright; and uphol[d] and protect[t] the rights of consumers to use innovative technology lawfully.” See http://www.publicknowledge.org/about. Google has contributed to Public Knowledge for years before the complaint in the case at bar was filed. Public Knowledge has commented on the case. See Ex. II (available at http://www.publicknowledge.org/blog/copyright-compatibility); Ex. JJ (available at http://www.publicknowledge.org/blog/gpl-does-not-depend-copyrightability-apis).

E. Center for Democracy and Technology

Everywhere,” available at https://www.cdt.org/blogs/cdt/1306oracle-v-google-win-software-everywhere). Google is not aware of any other posts or commentary by Mr. Miller.

F. Lauren Weinstein at Vortex Technology

Lauren Weinstein is affiliated with Vortex Technology, an organization that has conducted research for Google. Mr. Weinstein has commented on the case on his personal Google+ feed. See, e.g., Ex. LL (available at https://plus.google.com/s/Lauren%20weinstein%20%26%20google%20%26%20oracle).

G. Competitive Enterprise Institute

Competitive Enterprise Institute (“CEI”) is “a non-profit public policy organization dedicated to advancing the principles of limited government, free enterprise, and individual liberty.” See http://cei.org/about-cei. Google has contributed to CEI for years before the complaint in the case at bar was filed. CEI has commented about the case. See Ex. MM (available at http://cei.org/citations/apple-samsung-chiefs-pick-their-marbles-and-go-home).

Dated: August 24, 2012

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

/s/ Robert A. Van Nest

By: ROBERT A. VAN NEST

Attorneys for Defendant GOOGLE INC.